Class 232.702 B892 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS REVELATION

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS REVELATION:

Fresh Evidence from Christian Sources and Josephus

BY

VACHER BURCH, D.D.

Lecturer in Theology, Liverpool Cathedral

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON MCMXXVII

232.902
B892

82214

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Made and Printed in Great Britain
by The Whitefriars Press, Ltd.,
London and Tonbridge.

TO

THE RIGHT REVD. A. A. DAVID, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

No man will be unwise enough to ascribe this book to him; and none wise enough to analyse the delight with which it is made his.

PREFACE

It is not unusual to hear the claim in these days that there are permanent and impermanent elements in the teaching of Jesus Christ. A crisis in the world's history, a change in philosophical fashions, a new hypothesis in Natural Science, a theological doctrine receiving some renewal of thought through the ingress of a social or æsthetic emotion, are among the causes of the claim for the discrimination of those elements. It is best that none of these influences should be allowed to designate what is of yesterday and what of to-day. For, as we know, the crisis bewilders us; fashions in philosophy have too swift wings; Science is most slowly making up her mind, and is not responsible for the Apologist's most easy method unto generalisations with her hypotheses; an invading emotion can keep alive the shell of theological definitions which we ought to have relinquished before the invader gave it a semblance of other power to interpret, whilst the four of these influences can and do ignore the fundamental condition of understanding, which is that Jesus Christ and His revelation must be mutually understood, if at all we would understand Christianity. This book is written with the hope of throwing light on what are the essential qualities of the revelation of

Christ, and resultantly on what and who He is. The impulses for its composition are not of the sort which lead to a selective manner concerning what in the teaching of Jesus "stains the white radiance of Eternity" and what does not. The reason for the book is simply that discoveries have been made which educe the original values of His revelation.

Its main theme is not Josephus in a version other than Greek. The Jewish historian is an item here. This has been said before in the *Diocese of Liverpool Review*. It must be said again because certain reports of discovery, which have gone throughout the world, will persist in making Josephus supplant Jesus Christ and the Christian origins as my theme. The Jewish historian can help us to ring in the Christ that has been all the time. That is much; and especially for his own reputation as a truthful historian. But the re-discovery of several passages for the text of the *Jewish War* will not make the needed summertide of Christian thought. What is new in him can inter-operate, as we shall see, with new material from Christian sources, and thus he will find that enhancement which could have come to him in no other way. There is another reason why emphasis should be laid on his minor *rôle* in this book. The thistledown of rumour has been blowing through a certain part of Europe. It has sown a report with which Sir James Barrie might deal. There is no second act to *What Every Woman Knows*. Its inspiration might be found in the subject "How a book could be pirated that could

not be published and whose manuscript could not be seen." Such things ought not to be done by those who may be presumed to know better—even to add to the gaiety or worry of a theological scholar's life. And certainly such a rumour will not give a bigger place in the book to Josephus than the record of such evidence from him, which shall say that he has at last proved that an almost contemporary Jewish historian could tell the truth about Jesus Christ and His religion.

The plan of this book is a simple one. It discloses by means of discovery, first of all, how the earliest Jewish writers consciously depraved Jesus Christ and His revelation into a figure and message of contempt. Then, from Christian documents of as early a date, is shown that because we have forgotten certain of the original values of Himself and revelation we have unconsciously made Him and it into forms which do not belong to them. We go on to find, again by the help of ancient documents, that we have passed over for many centuries the fact that Jesus Christ had a teaching mode to His revelation. By its recovery we learn what was His and its attitude to the religions of the ancient world—Greek, Roman and Jewish. We also learn that He used the Old Testament in an original way. Such a discovery can help us to solve one of the greater problems in Christian thought which is to understand how to use the Old Testament as He used it. Thence we proceed to rediscover what was the first manner of interpreting Him : what was His way with Himself and the God He revealed. No

thoughtful man can doubt that if we can recover those values then we shall have gained an aid with inestimable powers to enlighten our understanding of Christian Origins. There are documents which can yield us such aid. And in the third chapter of this book is the pioneer attempt to use them. We can recover the primary values of Revealer and revelation. And that is the cardinal necessity of Christian thought. Our results lead us on to recatch the first and vital meanings of some of the chief factors in Christ's revelation. Lastly, and as if to redress the deeds of other Jewish writers, Josephus brings us remarkable witness to Jesus Christ and the nature of His religion before the year 70, in an altogether new version of his *Jewish War*. The historian tells as a Jew the outline of the greater matters we have recovered from early Christian documents. Such discoveries were needed not only for the understanding of what Jesus was and taught and men believed Him to be down to the year 70, but also that we might understand Josephus.

These prefatory words must not close without an expression of warm gratitude to two honoured names : His Excellency the Serbian Ambassador, by the lavish use of his influence, has aided me in a search for the manuscripts of Josephus in the libraries of his native land ; and Professor Grass, of Dorpat University, most generously gave me a transcript of the principal novel passages in the mediæval Russian version of Josephus's *Jewish War*. Such acts take their place among the unforgettable pleasures of life.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE TALMUDISATION OF JESUS CHRIST	1
II.	CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE TWO TESTAMENTS	29
III.	CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE FIRST WAY OF INTERPRETING JESUS CHRIST	55
IV.	CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE NORMS OF THE REVELATION OF CHRIST	
	A. THE INTRUDED NORMS	99
	B. THE NAME *Son of Man* AND ITS USE BY JESUS	109
	C. THE TERM *Kingdom* AND ITS USE BY JESUS	116
	D. THE QUALITY OF THE WHOLE OF JESUS'S TEACHING	127
V.	CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND NEW EVIDENCE FROM JOSEPHUS	142

JESUS CHRIST AND HIS REVELATION

CHAPTER I

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE TALMUDISATION OF JESUS CHRIST

WHEN an Orientalist of the first rank published the dictum, "Jesus was not a Christian; he was a Jew,"[1] he had not summed up scientific opinion on Jesus Christ. He had written the chief reason for new discoveries in the study of Christian Origins. This judgment does not merely tell us the people among whom Jesus came: it affects the whole of the significances of Himself and His teaching. And what more or less has he done than continue the work of the Talmud against Jesus Christ? In that authority for the interpretation of the Jewish religion His values have been depraved, with a systematic effort that is in entire contrast with the treatment Moses has received at the hands of Christian interpreters. The present state of sterility in New Testament studies can be said to be due to this, that neither Jesus nor Moses is allowed to be himself. Nor can they be so

[1] Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1905, 113.

because of the unconscious and conscious talmudisation of Christian Origins which has reigned and still reigns over the interpretation of the New Testament. It must be understood that in this judgment there is no attempt at a contest of epigrams with the Göttingen scholar. That would be a waste of the time of human beings. He has to be understood who means so profoundly for the future of men and the world. Therefore, instead of the warfare of crackling words which, as we find in many writers of to-day, only serves to obscure the truth, we must go to the study of documents.

It is in the study of them that we shall escape any verbal approach to the wickedness of anti-Semitism. Documents will not permit us to say, "Jesus was a Christian; therefore we must kill any suggestion that He was a Jew." That agile thinker in the second century, Marcion, committed himself to that opinion. He succeeded in creating a Christ who lived and was buried in the creed of his sect. Therefore it will be wise to learn the lesson that this thinker can teach us. It will not preclude us from essaying the task, which Christian scholarship has yet failed to undertake, of putting the Old Testament and the allied exposition of Mosaism into that place which the revelation of Christ demands. The Jew is for Christianity human material, as each sort of humankind is, but Judaism is a scheme of ritual ideas and practices, even as the religion of the Samaritan or the Greek or the Roman. There is no truth so plain as this; where Jesus and His

teaching are viewed in relation with mankind, there they abrogate opinions and practices so as to release men unto the attainment of the riches of life. We shall find that this is done in a manner unrecognised as yet by our schemes of Christian ideas.

We have not then to answer an epigram or to attack a people ; we have rather to unearth from the Talmud what has been overlooked by centuries of Rabbinical and Christian students. The disregarded document, like the neglected fact in the study of physical science, may hold the discovery which can help us towards the beginnings of a restatement of the origins of our religion. For through it may appear to men and women what Jesus was and taught. And there are many of us human beings who, reading the pages of the Gospels, gain an impression that the One they enshrine was meant to be understood. We may learn from the Talmud what it means to talmudise Jesus Christ, and what it may mean that He should be Himself.

Among the documents which go to compose the Talmud is the important legal one known as the *Tractate Sanhedrin*. It represents the Jewish legal code at a period not later than the second century. Therein are some references to Jesus. It would be strange if there had not been. A general characteristic of these references, however, is that either the text of the document is most faulty or historical facts are filtered through a densely composed text. We shall see that by those portions of it upon which new light

can be thrown. For instance, the *Tractate* [2] contains what is said to be a list of the names of Jesus's disciples : " Jesus had five disciples : Mattai, Naqi, Netser, Buni, Todah."

The statement rouses the historic sense. Nowhere else is there a tradition that Jesus had five disciples. The form of their names also, except for the first of them, has no confirmation in other literature. When we go on to read the interpretation which follows the above statement our difficulties become more heavy and light—heavier because of the unhistorical character of the document, lighter because a discovery outside the Talmud enables us to find what and how historical matter has been used. The interpretative passage says :

" They brought Mattai (to the judges). He said to them : ' Shall Mattai be killed ? It is written : *Mattai* (lit. when) shall come and appear before God.' They said to him : ' Yea, Mattai shall be killed, for it is written : *Mattai* (lit. when) shall die and his name perish.'

" They brought Naqi. He said to them : ' Shall Naqi be killed ? It is written : And *Naqi* (lit. the innocent) and the righteous thou shalt not kill.' They said to him : ' Yea, Naqi shall be killed, for it is written : In the secret places he killeth *Naqi* ' (lit. the innocent).

" They brought Netser. He said to them : ' Shall Netser be killed ? It is written : And *Netser* (lit. a

[2] *Sanhedrin* 43a. I have conformed my translation in word and technical setting out with Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1925, 28 f., as a number of references will have to be made to this very able Jewish book.

branch) from his roots shall blossom.' They said to him: 'Yea, Netser shall be killed, for it is written: And thou wast cast forth from thy grave like an abhorred *Netser*' (lit. branch).

"They brought Buni. He said: 'Shall Buni be killed? It is written: *B'ni* (lit. my son), my first-born, Israel.' They said to him: 'Yea, Buni shall be killed, for it is written: I will slay *Bin'kha* (lit. thy son), thy firstborn.'

"They brought Todah. He said: 'Shall Todah be killed? It is written: A psalm for *Todah* (lit. thanks-giving).' They said to him: 'Yea, Todah shall be killed, for it is written: Whoso sacrificeth *Todah* (lit. thankofferings) honoureth Me.'"

It is plain, with an unshadowed certainty, that if the list of the names of the disciples is not history, then also these summaries of their trials for death are not history. If the five names could have been those of certain of Christ's disciples, we have no records of the end or of the course of their lives, with the exception of the putative Matthew, of whom we know something. A very different character is taken on by those entries in the Talmud if we see that they refer to the Lord and not to His disciples. Several of their items represent His names. Son and First-born are familiar ones. Jesus the Branch is another well-known name. The same comment is to be made on that of Innocent, if it, with the other two, is to be viewed from the standpoint of Christian thought, which finds Jesus Christ portrayed prophetically in the Old Testament. But

what is subjected to cynical comment in the Talmud is not that. Those names for Jesus are associated with two items which are not names. When these five items are taken together, we have disclosed to us two facts: first, names for Him; and second, their distinctive context. That latter is more the object of cynicism than the names themselves. Further, these names and context are such ancient matters of knowledge that this second century document in the Talmud has erroneously made of them a list of the disciples of Jesus Christ.

When the three of these items which are names for Jesus are put back into the context which is being lampooned, the two Talmudic statements have sense. Their endeavour is to turn the edge of the anti-Judaism of the teaching of Jesus Christ. That is the factor neglected by Rabbinical and Christian students alike: the inherent power of Christ's revelation to overthrow the religions of the ancient world. Here we shall state the results of the recovery of this context; elsewhere we shall see what powers of illumination it has for the original values and mode of the teaching of Christ. Let us tabulate our results to give them the edge they ought to possess:

Tractate Sanhedrin	*Christian Source it satirises*
1. Kills one who is called	1. Asserts as names of Christ
Son	Son
Innocent	Innocent
Branch.	Branch
	who cannot die.

2. Makes this one never to appear before God, whose name is "When" even on the earth.	2. Asserts that Christ was, and is, and shall be for ever.
3. Opposes with scorn the overthrow of the "sacrifices of bulls and the blood of goats."	3. Asserts that "the sacrifice of thanksgiving" is the only sort demanded by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

This is an actual find and not the hypothetical shadow of a document, evoked to say something different from the Talmud. An important document in Latin will demonstrate that. In it, within a few lines of one another, is the first of the two names for Jesus, and the Old Testament source which has been made Christian so as to yield the second name reads: "The innocent (*i.e.*, *Naqi*) and the righteous thou shalt not kill."[3] That is the very source used in the Talmud. Again, in the same document, a few lines above the tiny section just mentioned, is the name Branch,[4] made Christ's by the choice of a piece from the Old Testament that is baptised into the service of His teaching.[5] Once again, the fact of His being from the beginning

[3] Cyprianic *Testimonia* ii., 14.

[4] *Test.* ii. 11; see also Justin, *Trypho*, 86, 87, i. *Apol.* 32; Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos* ix.; Irenaeus, *Apostolical Preaching*, 59, with which compare *Adversus Haereses* iii. 10; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 13; Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* II. ii. 19, II. iii. 41, III. ii. 39, VIII. iii. 28 f., *Eclogae Propheticae* iii. 41, *Contra Marcellum* I. xx. 16; Evagrius, *Altercatio* iv. 15; Isidore, Hisp. *de Fide Catholica contra Judaeos* I. ix. 1. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1905, 93, had suggested that in Naqi, Netser and Buni might be names for Jesus Christ; but he has not seen the meaning and origin of the *Sanhedrin* document. Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, 1902, 57, 3, has tried to see Luke in Naqi, and "Christians" in Netser; Klausner, 30, John, the son of Zebedee, in Buni, which, he says, is a corruption of Yuani, and Thaddeus in Todah. These equations are not possible ones.

[5] On this most important matter for Christology, see *infra*, 29 ff.

and unto the age of the ages is the burden of this document.[6] And, in the last place, the abrogation of blood sacrifices as a principle of all earlier ritual religions is a cardinal concept of the document. Moreover, it is there instrumentally represented by an excerpt from the Psalms, made quite new in all its connotations through the revelation of Christ—that is, Ps. xlix. (L) 14, 15: "Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God a sacrifice of thanksgiving."[7] These propinquities do not come in two early documents by the fortuitous concurrence of fragments of Hebrew literature. That concurrence would have to be dual, and also it would have to be informed with a like constructive motive. Such literary miracles do not happen. It is only history that can disclose them, and then show how an opponent in religion tries to abase another. The Christian usage will have preceded the Jewish satire. For satire needs something to be known, and some one to have gone before it, that either should be the subject of its comment. Moreover, the two Talmudic statements of the Jewish satirisation of Christian things are both not later than the second century.[8] This depravation of Jesus and His teaching is contemporaneous with the more base and cynical depravation of their values in the legend of *Ben-Pandera* or *Pantere*.

[6] Cp. *Test.* ii. 1 ff.

[7] *Test.* i. 14. The Cyprianic document has "sacrificium laudis." This is evidently the distinctive reading of this most ancient Christian document. Cp., *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho* xx. 9; *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 129.

[8] Klausner, 28, claims the longer statement to be an "Amoraitic addition." This means a sixth century date for it. But he, as other Talmudists, has wholly misconceived the nature and date of the statement.

Every one knows the filthy story that, for instance, Celsus [9] had heard : how Jesus was born to Mary by a Roman legionary who had the name of " Panther," and how Joseph the carpenter had divorced her when he knew the facts of her life. It was a Jewish legend that had its place in the Talmud,[10] and is decoratively set out in the *Tol'doth Yeshu*. Now that story was an old one when Celsus recounted it somewhen in the seventies of the second century. It seems that the tale was virulent in the time of Origen, for he appears to have countered it by what looks like a genealogical fiction : he makes the father of Joseph to bear the name Ben-Pantere.[11] Roman legionaries bore the name of Panthera, as early Latin inscriptions tell us.[12] This fact alone does not disclose the truth of the story, but the reason why the burden of scurrility was put upon Roman shoulders. For it is evident that the inspiring motive of the tale must have been on the Aramaic or Greek side. We have discovered the Greek monitor. Whether behind that lies an Aramaic original is for us a question of secondary importance.

Among early names for Jesus were two which may sound strange to us. There was a time when He was known both as the *Panther* and the *Bear*. The source

[9] Origen, *Contra Celsum* I. ix. 1 ; *P.G.* xi. 721.

[10] *E.g.*, *Sanhedrin* 67a ; *Shabbath* 104b.

[11] He has been followed by other Greek writers, *e.g.*, Epiphanius, *Adv. Haereses* III. ii. 78, *P.G.* xlii. 708d ; John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthodoxa* iv. 14, *P.G.* xciv. 1156d ; Hippolytus of Thebes xviii b, ed. Diekamp, *Hippolytos von Theben*, 1898, 50 ; Andronicus, *Dialogus contra Judaeos* xxxviii., *P.G.* cxxxiii. 860a.

[12] Deissmann, *Der Name Panthera* (*Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke*), 1906, ii. 871 ff.

of those names was in Hosea.[13] That in turn depends from another prophet, set to a use he would not understand, who is Daniel—a source,[14] it will be recalled, for the name which brings us no surprise because of its familiarity, Son of Man. The Danielic context of the source for that name speaks of great animals of swift and terrible strength. A similar impulse to that which, working on Old Testament material, adduced the name Son of Man must have stirred in the minds of the early Christians when they were led to call Jesus by names which may astonish us.[15] Their remarkable character is by no means made less when we learn that these names occur in texts of the anti-Judaic usage of Old Testament citations,[16] which was inspired and initiated by Jesus for the purposes of His revelation. The satirical

[13] xiii. 7, 8.

[14] Dan. vii. 13 ff.

[15] It is perhaps not impossible that, as the names were current in the very early days of Christian persecution, they who had to face wild animals for the sake of their faith might have given such names to Jesus, as to One who should come in fierce judgment on their persecutors.

[16] Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae* iii. 10, διότι ἐγώ εἰμι ὡς Πάνθηρ τῷ Ἐφραιμ (Hos. v. 14), and follows this with Hos. xiii. 7. To bring out the natural qualities of the animal that it could be made into a name for Christ, Eusebius cites the *Physica* of Didymus—a fragment which recurs in Aelian, *Hist. Animal.* v. 40. There can be no doubt of the use of the name *Panther* as an anti-cultic one. Conybeare, *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 115, drew attention, some years ago, to what he considered to be "this citation so abruptly introduced" (*i.e.*, a conflation of Hos. xiii. 7 and v. 14) that he doubted if it could have reference to the story of Jesus being born ἀπὸ Πάνθηρο'. That accomplished scholar, whose loss many of us will feel for years to come in Patristic and New Testament work, apparently had overlooked Eusebius, and had not realised the anti-Judaism of the revelation of Christ. Thus he did not realise that the legend would certainly be based on an animal name for Jesus, used in the service of that principle of His teaching. Dalman and Laible, *Jesus and the Talmud*, 1893, 23, by making "son of Panther" to mean "son of sensuality," show at least one easy way for the satirist to make the ugly tale. Cp. Fick, *Die griechischen Personennamen*, 1894, 37, for animal names as Greek personal names.

depravation in the document from the Talmud was directed first against the content and principle of the revelation of Christ ; the second document in the same source depraves Him. Both phases of this talmudisation of Jesus Christ spring from the desire to counter His anti-cultic aims. Both are concerned with His names, for, as we shall see, these composed a most simple but potent vehicle for the bearing of the significances of Himself into the lives of the lowly. We have talmudised Christ, though not like the Jews. His crucifixion [17] was their process given the lips of Pilate. Their verbal cynicism is in the Talmudic code of law ; their mortal cynicism is in the extreme penalty of that law which was passed on Him in whom God was revealed to men. We talmudise Him, in varying manners, because we are so slow to gain the reasons why He has a message for men which is unlike any other in the history of the world. Some of our means of apology for Him, which are among the most considered expressions of the Christian faith, are certain signs of our talmudisation of Him, without whom Christianity is an amorphous structure of morality. That should be a suggestion of sufficient power to divert us from the notion that a reformation of Christian

[17] The Talmudic tradition (*Sanhedrin* 43a) seems to be that Jesus was hanged instead of crucified. Chwolshon and others have argued that this is history. As late as 1925 the view appears : Leclerc de Pulligny, *Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions*, 1925, ii. 251. This is another instance, however, where the Talmud has used the *Testimonia* way of Jesus's revelation, with the Old Testament, against Him and His religion. For we find in that way, Deut. xxi. 23, " Cursed is whoever is hung on the tree " ; cp., *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho* xcvi. 1 and xc. 1 ; *Dialogue of Attorasius and Zaccheus*, 41. Paul, *Gal.* iii. 13, has this *Testimonia* use.

thought could be even started by a renewal of polemical action against the Jews. The immorality of that act finds its true conclusion in the Pogrom. With such deeds the revelation of Jesus can have no part, for the passion of the Shepherd's search was first turned towards "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." That search is His revelation in action. He overthrows ideas and rites, but not men, if they will to be His.

Then it is a matter of most profound concern for the future of Christianity that we should learn not to talmudise. To do that is to deprave Jesus Christ. The Talmud has done this through regard for Moses. The Senussi have the same zeal for Mahomet. We talmudise by means of our subdual by and unto the Old Testament, not because we do not do what was done by Marcion. He did not realise that the New Testament was the book of Jesus Christ, and for that reason denied the physical world and the Old Testament. Other influences also caused his denials. We may not emulate them, since their most serious result was to make another Jesus Christ. The Christ of the Gospels does not require us to deny the Old Testament, but that we should understand Him and His use of the Old Testament. To accomplish both is to comprehend the Revealer and the determining principle of His revelation. The two so interwork that, lacking the latter, we may only see Him in part. If this is true, a startling conclusion comes into view: where He has not been followed in His use of the Old Testament, there we have been precluded from under-

standing Him and His teaching. Let us see the bearing of this conclusion from the standpoint of another religion. Aristotle was translated into Arabic by Mahometans. The Kûran and its prophet would have had very different forms if those translators had philosophised its text, and depersonalised the prophet into an embodiment of Aristotle's conception of " the good man." Further, as the contents of the Kûran had been made into something undreamt of at Medina, so the figure of Jesus Christ in it, as that of an Old Testament prophet, would have been attenuated into an organic bundle of foreign ideas with a personal name. If these things had been done to the Kûran, does any one doubt that action would have been taken by the authorities of the Arab University in Cairo? Their protest would have an Arabian swiftness and fierceness, because of the misuse of the text of the Kûran. The book of the founder of their religion and the figure of the founder had been given shapes which history could not permit.

We are unconscious that we talmudise the figure and teaching of Jesus Christ. We acutely complain that the book of the Arabian religion kûranises Jesus Christ. And yet Mahomet only did what the Jews and we, in our various ways, have done. Let us put the New Testament in the place of the Kûran, and then review our parable. If the Talmud depraves the values of Jesus Christ with cynicism, and the Kûran talmudises Him so that He becomes an inferior Jewish prophet, then we are guilty of a double talmudisation of the One

we are said to follow. We commit that offence, firstly, as accessory to the fact, and, secondly, by concerted deed. And yet what both Talmud and Kûran do consciously we do doubly, not knowing that we do as they. There is nothing that seems so natural to us as that we should fill Jesus and His teaching with Old Testament values, in order that He might fulfil Moses and the prophets. We judaise Him even when we call Him Son of God and Redeemer. He is shaded off into the ancient scheme of thoughts and practices, as if it were impossible to believe that the New had superseded the Old Testament. We talmudise Him with reverence; the Talmudists did that with obloquy. Then we clothe this Jesus Christ with garments from Cappadocia, or Hippo, or Chalcedon, or we move down the centuries and find Him garments from Paris, or Erfurt, or Geneva—strange and many-hued robes borrowed from Orpheus, and Plato, and Plotinus, and many another wardrobe wherein was never hung the seamless robe that belonged to Him. This is our other act of unconscious talmudisation. We remake Him not knowing that we do it. So unconscious are we that we place our creations in the will and under the care of the Holy Spirit. The frequent beauty and constant pathos of our work, however, cannot balance our neglect to cultivate that delicately eager conscientiousness towards what He Himself claimed to be and taught, that polar loyalty, from wherever we are in our thinking on man and the world, to the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Is it a demand so grievous that it cannot be borne that we should put both Testaments into a rightful estimate of their powers, the Old Testament as the book of Israel and the New Testament as the book of Jesus Christ? To lighten the task and our sense of what it might mean to the things in which we have been educated, there is surely one remedial plea: if Jesus Christ had His own estimate of the religion of Judaism, we ought to rediscover it, for the sake of clarifying what now is claimed as Christianity. And again, if the impression of Him is true, which none of our ways of talmudisation has been quite able to erase—that there is in Him and His teaching a potency of life unshared by any other in the world's history—then it ought to be a glad duty, for those of us who call ourselves His disciples, to quest for its release so that we might comprehend it and Him; even a gladder duty than the searcher knows who seeks the fact which can help to heal the body, or put his fellows on the threshold of a new world of knowledge. The manhood of men is as yet pathetically unfruitful of those achievements in outlook and co-operant life which we know ought to ennoble the hamlets and cities of all countries. There is not one type of racial culture that is not a denial of what we must mean by that great corporate creation Civilisation. Before, then, we who call ourselves Christians turn our eyes from the argument for thinking Christ's thoughts after Him, or close our ears because we are satisfied that what has been is immune from neglect and disfigurement of

Him and His words, shall we not exercise the humility of all true learners and say: "He may have been greater than we know; therefore for man's sake we will learn of Him"? For us to have that spirit would mean an enrichment of the world's life beyond all present dreams of ethical and social reform.

Now, to achieve these living reciprocities as between teacher and taught, we must not leap to the erroneous judgment that we ought to establish a new movement of opinion with the name Neo-Marcionism. The anti-Judaism of the revelation of Jesus Christ created, for instance, Paul. He was not a Marcion. The second century thinker made Paul's Christ into a glittering paradox, because he was obedient to the Cerdonic dualism which subjected him. He was never Christ's knight, and especially was he not that in the lowliest lessons to be learnt. Marcion was content to talmudise. He remade Jesus and His teaching after his own erratically insurgent style. Because we dare not add to the manifold manners of remaking Jesus Christ, we have no reason to inquire whether we must institute Neo-Marcionism to liberate Jesus and His teaching to do their work for men and women. It has not yet been done. It is manifest that the contemporary tendencies to talmudisation will still inhibit that work. A few years ago attention was drawn to the fact that from Reimaurus to Wrede [18]—a long procession of writers on the subject of Jesus Christ during the period

[18] Schweitzer, *Von Reimaurus zum Wrede* (1906), which was translated into English as *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*.

of the criticism of the New Testament—Jesus Christ had been remade in almost as many ways as there were interpreters. Their achievements might have been summed up in a phrase: they had talmudised. The author of the book appended his own view of the great subject. It claimed to be done objectively. And he remade Jesus in terms of Jewish Apocalyptic. He was a more thorough talmudiser than most of the writers he had analysed. In contemporary America, for instance, there are three dominant tendencies in religious thought: Fundamentalism, Modernism and Experimentalism.[19] Each of these tendencies is Talmudic where Jesus Christ is spoken of or written about, since each remakes Him in its own terms, and by reason of the basic instrumentality of full or partial invasion by or reaction from the Old Testament. The latter method is also a Marcionite one. It is not the way of Jesus. He abrogated Judaism, as we shall see, that He might transfigure those portions of the Old Testament which were utilised by Him. This He did by invading them with the novel life of His own revelation. The Hebrew writings, then, underwent the same profound change as Jews when they answered His call; the prophecies became wondrously new, as did the men. It is a primary gesture of His work that He never puts aside anything or any one but to cause thing and person to come within the re-creative artistry of what and whom He revealed. This is what moves the anti-Judaism of His revelation.

[19] This terminology is borrowed from Lake's recent book on the subject;

That truth was once the realised principle of New Testament interpretation. Some of its guiding formulæ are still extant. When a great interpretative motive is rediscovered, it leads to the discovery of documents which conserve its work. Because we have forgotten what, for instance, Chrysostom [20] knew, that "all the Epistles of Paul are anti-Judaic," we have gone as far in our treatment of some of the most early and valuable specimens of commentatorial guidance as to say that they come from Marcion. This aid to interpretation consists of short Prefaces in Latin to the Epistles of Paul. These *Argumenta* [21] are found in some of the most important Vulgate manuscripts, without either the text or Prefaces to the Gospels. Therein is said to be the first mark of Marcion's work. It will be recalled that he edited a text of the Epistles, and called it the *Apostolicon*. When, too, the text of the Pauline *Argumenta* is examined, and a tiny sheaf of phrases made from them like the following: "lex et circumcisio" (from the Galatians Prologue), "lex et prophetae" (Romans), "secta legis Judaicae" (Corinthians), "scripturae Judaicae" (Titus), and

[20] In *Acta Apostolorum, Hom.* xxxvii. 2, *P.G.* lx. 264.

[21] For critical statements of Marcion's authorship and text of Prologues, De Bruyne, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1907, 1 ff., 257 ff.; Coissen, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1909, 36 ff. and 97 ff.; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1911, 353 ff.; Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, 1913, 205 ff.; *The Character and History of Pelagius' Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul* (*Proceedings of British Academy*), 1915–1916, 261 ff.; Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum*, 1913, ii. 1, 41 ff., and 1922, ii. 2, 153; Harnack, *Die Entstehung des Neues Testament*, 1914, 106, *Marcion*, 1924, 127* ff., *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, November, 1925. In his fascinating book called *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*, 1908, 277, Dom Chapman also accepts the authorship of Marcion for the Prologues.

" pseudo-apostolos " (in several of the Prologues), is informed with the presumption that these collocated and descriptive phrases represent the Marcionite antithesis between Hebrew and Christian things, it is manifest that the case, on the surface, for the second century thinker is almost complete. The factor which finishes the case is the argument that the original series of Prologues must have been written in the order of Marcion's *Apostolicon*, for the language of the extant Prologue to the Romans, it is said, can be understood only as that of the Galatians precedes it. Before the discovery of the anti-Judaic and anti-Gentilic principle in the revelation of Christ—that quality in it which brought death to Jesus and the derisive treatment of His revelation at the hands of the Talmudists—the authorship of Marcion thus presented might have seemed impregnably sure as to its outer walls.

The economy of the argument for his authorship is, however, not so imposing. Its parts are chiefly three : (1) it is said that the Prologue to the Romans declares that the founder of the Church in that city was not Paul, but certain " false apostles " who had put off their paganism to lead Roman Christians into heresy ; (2) the Colossians Preface is claimed as treating the question of the Church's foundation there in the same manner ; (3) that the appearance of the Epistle to the Laodiceans in the Pauline Canon is another sign of Marcion. We may test the strength of these supports by an examination of the several Prologues.

The Romans Preface [22] reads: "Romans are in parts of Italy. These were reached beforehand by false apostles, under the name of the Lord Jesus Christ were led back into the Law and the Prophets. These the Apostle recalls to the true evangelical faith, writing to them from Corinth." Is not this a fair summary of the reasons for the writing of the Epistle? Its author may have a pedestrian mind. He has no elasticity either of expression or of faculty to summarise. But he knows Paul. For instance, when the verses of the first chapter to the Romans are read down we find the Apostle saying that he is now ready to preach the Gospel in Rome, where often before he had purposed to go. Disciples of Jesus were already there, and among them were Jewish Christians.[23] Paul evidently singles out a typical leader among them and the Roman disciples of Christ, and charges him as "a blind leader of the blind" with leading men back into the cult practices and thought of Judaism. From that appearance of the "false prophet" the message of the Epistle sweeps on with its passionate declaration of the "evangelical faith," shot through and through with the anti-Judaic *Testimonia* [24] and principle of the revelation of Christ.[25] We cannot read this Epistle

[22] In the light of my succeeding work on these Prologues, it may be well to reproduce here a slightly different text from that I have translated. It is in *Cod. Mus. Brit. Harl.* 2804: "Romani, qui in urbe Roma in Christum crediderant, ita a falsis apostolis depravati erant, ut sub nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi in legem et circumcisionem inducerentur: hos revocat ad veram et evangelicam fidem scribens iis ab Athenis." Harnack, 128*, claims this as being a modification of the original text. Ought we not rather to see in it a scribe making the original a little more intelligible?

[23] Rom. ii. 17 ff.

[24] *E.g.*, ix.–xi., etc.

[25] On this important matter see *infra*, chaps. ii.-iv.

without seeing that "the Apostle calls them back to the true faith of the Gospel." Its Prologue has the first century hold on the principles of Christ's revelation, and a veritable insight into Paul's thought. It makes no sort of unhistorical reference to the foundation of the Church in Rome.

The Colossian Prologue opens pretty much as the one we have studied: "Colossians, and these also, like the Laodiceans, are Asians; and they had been reached beforehand by pseudo-apostles, nor came the Apostle to them, but through an epistle the Apostle redirects them." [26] If Marcion wrote those words, he has been wronged from the second century till now. This Prologue has no more to do with the foundation of the Church at Colossæ than that to the Romans. Its material is from the Epistle itself, and once more with a stolid but true grasp of it and of the revelation of Jesus. Paul warns the Colossians against the reassertion of "the traditions of men," the sway of ordinances, and "the commandments and doctrines of men." He, therefore, is calling them back, if the Epistle means what it says. Once more, the prologist knows Paul.

When we come to the Laodicean Prologue, we find that the *Codex Fuldensis*—the famous Vulgate manuscript of the Pauline Epistles which dates from the sixth century—had this Epistle in its exemplar immediately after the Colossian Epistle, but that it omits

[26] The closing words concern Archippus and Ephesus.

both Prologue and text of the apocryphal writing.[27] The reason for its omission is the canonical one ; the Epistle was not in the Vulgate Canon. We may not see on the part of the scribe of this manuscript a total blindness to Marcionism in the Prologues he copied, and a pair of open eyes for the taint of Marcion in the Laodicean Epistle. Moreover, it is evident that this Epistle thus omitted, for canonical reasons, was not the Epistle of the same name attributed to Marcion.[28] The Belgian scholar, Dom de Bruyne, has reconstituted the missing Prologue from a ninth century manuscript.[29] His text bears some notes of speech which are later than the other Prologues ; there is no valid reason to doubt that it is the Prologue to the Laodicean Epistle rejected by the Fulda scribe, and that this Epistle is the innocuous but charming fourth century mosaic of Pauline phrases known by that name. Because the Fulda scribe was copying a manuscript in which a fourth century Prologue and Epistle

[27] Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, 1868, 291.

[28] Harnack, 134* ff., has spent much learning to seek the Marcionite Laodicean Epistle and Prologue, with their relations to the other Prologues. But the search, so far as these *Argumenta* are concerned, is a needless one. He doubts De Bruyne's discovery of the missing Prologue, but solely on the ground that he is looking for something Marcionite, and this he should not.

[29] *Cod. Einsiedlensis*, 371 : " Laudicenses sunt Asiani, hos conlaudat beatus apostolus pauluo quod semel accepta fidem evangelicam perstiterunt in uerbo ueritatis scribeno eis." Lightfoot, *Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon*, 1875, 363 ff., edits a fifteenth century English translation of this Prologue where it is bound up with that to the Colossians. It reads : " Laodiscensis ben also Colocenses as tweye townes and oo peple in maners these ben of Asie, and among hem hadden be false apostolis and desieyvde manye ; therefore the postle bringith hem to mynde of his conversacion and trewe preching of the gospel, and excith hem to be stidfast in the trewe witt and love of Christ, and to be of oo will." This fifteenth century scribe may have had a text of the Prologues like that in the Harleian manuscript above cited. It really looks as if he had rather the original text, and had understood it.

appeared, it must not be concluded that all the other Prologues to the genuine Pauline Epistles are of that date. They must have been earlier than it. That Prologue could not have been the exemplar of the others, with their earlier phraseology. They are, then, to be put somewhen in the second century. Moreover, if it was a false scent to follow after Marcion in them, it would not be a right one to seek him in the single instance of the Laodicean Epistle. Both Prologue and Epistle are imitative of the genuine documents. The first imitates their loyalty to the main motives of the Apostle's understanding of the Lord's revelation, and the second selects from the phrases of the Epistles of Paul. This third support, in the economy of the argument for Marcion's authorship, adds to the witness that the Prologues are genuinely based on the text of the Pauline Epistles.

What of the outer walls of the argument? Is that group of phrases, which we have quoted, composed after all of marks of the presence of Marcion, or are they also marks that their writer knew where Paul places his steps in thought after the prints left by his Lord? We must weigh those of them which have not yet been examined, and each in its context. And first, the phrase in that Prologue which is said to be the necessary primate to the whole series. It is in the *Argumentum* [30] to the Epistle to the Galatians:

[30] I reproduce the text of this document because of the stress that has been put upon it: "Galatae sunt Graeci, hi verbum veritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt; sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a falsis apostolis, ut in legem et circumcisionem verterentur, hos apostolus

" Galatians are Greeks. These accepted the word of truth from the Apostle, but after his departure were tempted by false prophets, and they reverted to the Law and circumcision. These the Apostle called back to the true faith, writing to them from Ephesus." Could a simpler and truer summary of the Epistle be made ? It seizes its anti-Judaism, but almost with gentleness—a small point of literary contrast. For there is scarcely a document in the Pauline *corpus* which expresses with such splendid point and *verve* the principle of the revelation that here is called by its true name.[31] Marcion would have been a disciple to Christ second only to Paul if he had expressed himself with this discipular passion concerning the Gospel of Christ. And a comparison of the prologist's language with the Epistle removes any idea that, linguistically or doctrinally, it should precede the Romans Prologue, and as well the whole series of *Argumenta*.

The second phrase is more individual. " Others led back to the sect of the Jewish Law " is a phrase in apposition to " some by the verbose eloquence of philosophy." [32] This is from the Prologue to 1

revocat ad fidem veritatis scribens eis ab Epheso." Is it not doubtful that a native of Pontus, as Marcion was, would say that the Galatians were Greeks ?

[31] Cp. Gal. i. 5 ff. The whole Epistle can be cited in support of the Prologue. Concerning the name " false prophets," the preacher of any other gospel is " accursed " ; note work of " false brethren " (ii. 4 ff.), and how Galatians have been " bewitched " by Judaisers.

[32] " Et subversi multifarie a falsis apostolis " is the preceding clause to this apposition. The Prologue opens with the statement of the Apostle's preaching to them, and closes with the words " hos revocat apostolus ad veram (et) evangelicam sapientiam." The play on the word " wisdom " in the early chapters of 1 Corinthians accounts for the last word I have quoted from the Prologue.

Corinthians. An appeal to the text of the Epistle has not to go further than its first chapter for the source of the second clause of this apposition: "the wisdom of words," "the wordmonger of this age," and the criticism of the Greeks to whom the revelation is "foolishness." The first clause is a flash-like summary of the attitude of Christ's revelation towards Judaism rather than one which can be textually paralleled in the Epistle. If we look again into the first chapter, we find that Paul has followed his Master in His description of oppositive Judaism. Matthew [33] tells how scribes and Pharisees ask Him to work wonders instead of desiring to learn of Him, and Jesus describes them as "an evil and adulterous generation seeking signs." And upon that charge He superposes the declaration of His revelation by means of its teaching mode. Paul knows that saying, and he preaches that revelation with its mode. Now one of that revelation's royal and fresh enactments is the New Law that puts aside the old Law. The Sermon on the Mount, as will be shown later, has been wooing us to that knowledge down through the centuries. Thus the prologist has a first century sense of the antithetic nature of the Jewish Law, and almost a Pauline passionateness of phrasing the great things of his religion, not that the Jew be condemned, but that he should come to "the true wisdom of the Evangel."

[33] xii. 38 ff.; 1 Cor. 1. 22. Bricka (see *infra*, 65) has recently shown quite clearly the dependence of Paul on the words of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels. It is impossible to work the contrary hypothesis that these literal parallels are signs of the influence of Paul's words or thoughts on the text of the Gospels.

The third phrase looks most individual. For the Prologue to Titus warns against " the Judaic writings." The Epistle itself warns disciples of Christ against " Judaic myths and commandments of men." A version of the Prologue, indeed, has the alternative reading " Judaic fables," but its writer has been described as " a tendencious corrector." [34] He ought to have been called " a good interpreter " of Paul and the Prologue. For if we regard the fact that it was Jesus's way with the Old Testament, and not the Old Testament itself, which is in question when His revelation is concerned, then we shall see that both prologist and Apostle can speak of " the Hebrew writings " in contrast with the message of Christ. Marcion, as far as we may judge from the remains of his writings, had no measured sense of Jesus's way with the Old Testament, nor any fine loyalty to His revelation that he should maintain its terms. These are Paul's motives, and the prologist to Titus reflects them. Marcion could not have written any one of the Prologues, for history denies to him the movement of such tides within his spirit.

These Prologues do compose the earliest extant exegetical helps for the interpretation of the Pauline Epistles. Their grasp of the meaning of Paul's writings and of the fundamental principle of the revelation of Christ makes them to be very early.[35]

[34] Harnack, 129*.

[35] We ought to have been warned that Marcionism was not in these Prologues by the treatment given to them at the hands of earlier interpreters of the New Testament. Some of them were face to face with late Marcion-

They come to us in the greater Vulgate manuscripts, and it seems most reasonable to insist that they must have been known to the " old Roman " [36] version of the New Testament. In that text, it is said, there are Marcionite readings.[37] We have need to be careful, before readings are firmly classified in that manner, to be quite sure that we do not reject certain as not being original. For the same reason we have to guard against making the Prologues come from the pen of the famous erratic in Christian opinion, lest we fail to grasp some of the original lines of Christian thought. The Vulgate version of the Bible, which has been for so long the book of Latin Christianity, has in no sense of the word Marcion as its literary parent.

Its oldest strain of text contains a more precious possession than a Marcionite inheritance. These simple Prologues recall us to the fact that, because we have for so long left in abeyance the great things they tell, we talmudise Jesus Christ and His revelation.

ism. It seems incredible that they should know the thing in men and not in documents. See, for example, Ambrosiaster, *Commentaria in XIII. Epistolas Beati Pauli*, *In Ep. ad Rom.*, *P.L.* xvii. 45a, *Ep. ad Eph.* 371d, *Ep. ad Col.* 421a, or Pelagius, who cites the Prologues in full, and in his Expositions of the Pauline Epistles shows that he has a keen sense of what Marcionism is. Cp. Rom. vii. 12, Eph. iii. 9 (Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*, Text, 1926, 57 and 359; also Souter, *Pelagius' Expositions*, Introduction, 1922, 50 ff.). Pelagius shows a proper sense of the term " false apostles." This may be seen from the following instances: 1 Cor. i. 12: " sub nomine apostolorum pseudo-apostolos tangit, qui eos per sapientiam circumuenerant mundi "; or Col. ii. 11: " hic iam pseudo-apostolos taxat, ut ne, ab ipsis quidem seducantur "; or Rom. xv. 20, where the " pseudo-apostles " are shown to be those who build on other foundations than Christ. These and other examples seem to me to be sure indications that Pelagius understood the Prologues, and used them in his expository work. The text of the Prologues as they appear in Pelagius has been edited by Souter, and can be seen in Gwynn's reproduction of *Liber Ardmachanus* (1913).

[36] On this version see especially Ales, *Novatien*, 1925, 42 ff.

[37] Cp. Plooij, *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron*, 1925, 72 ff.

They show us the way back to the first things of our religion. Paul can do this better than they, for he exhibits how a human being grew who dared to learn of Jesus Christ. We are all human beings; and we cannot afford any longer to avoid the task of foregoing our ways of remaking Him and His revelation, if men would be alive in all the powers they possess.

These discoveries of what the Talmud has done to Jesus Christ, and how we have talmudised Him, impel us to go on with our search after the original energies and values of His revelation.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE TWO TESTAMENTS

"In the opinion of Jesus and in that of the Jews, the will of God was to be found in the law of Moses and in the other Hebrew writings." That is the completion of Wellhausen's judgment on Jesus. It seems that there is no New Testament, but only the Old Testament. Therefore there is no subject of higher importance for the understanding of His mind than the use He made of the Hebrew writings. Discovery in such a quarter is bound to be of a sort which either endorses or reverses the critical or theological significance of the quoted formula. It seems very natural that He should use the Old Testament; and, with the aid of a theological view of inspiration, it has appeared equally natural to interpret the New in the light of the Old. An historical review of the creative factors of European theology will have to regard these two ways of viewing His use of the Old Testament as being either the shallow or the deep manner of remaking Him, the first being a thinning way with the substance of a revelation which finds its perfect flower in Christianity, and the second being the deeper manner of making Him more or less after the fashion of Moses and Isaiah.

During the past seventy years the problem of the

Old in the New Testament has been studied by a number of scholars. They have classified the quotations from the Old Testament after many styles. From among these we will choose five characteristic ones—that is, of the sort which has come to conclusions concerning the reasons for citing the Hebrew writings. Our first instance we may call the *Full Talmudic Method*. The scholar to whom this is due writes [1]: "Their Scripture exegesis is substantially that which we find in the Talmud—the same methods and principles and, to some extent, the same results. In addition to this, they are affected in a special manner by their Messianic belief, that is, by the fact that for them (as was not the case with the Jewish expounders of the Scriptures) the Messiah had already appeared, and His earthly career was known." Therefore, "knowing the events of the Christ's earthly career, they could compare them with the Old Testament, and find the anticipation of them in the Prophets."

Our second is the *Partial Talmudic Method*. An outstanding Dutch scholar says [2]: "The Christian religion, as it is known from the books of the New Testament, is a more highly developed form, or rather it is the completion, of Israel's religion. . . . Prophets and Psalmists were interpreted according to the standards of the new ideas and requirements, and that in a manner quite involuntary, without any consciousness of the freedom which was being used."

[1] Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, 1884, xx. ff.
[2] Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, 1877, 534.

This view, then, embraces the notion that the Jewish mind in the Christian era could discover a second sense in the Hebrew writings. Though that is the manner of the Talmudists, we must call this a partial Talmudic method in that, unlike the first, this new sense in the old material is the discovery and message of what is claimed to be another religion.

Our third is the *Accommodated Talmudic Method.* This method is the oldest of the five. For its compiler [3] there are two sorts of accommodation in the Old Testament citations; one is what he calls the "legitimate rhetorical" use and the other as being dictated by the particular incident with which the Evangelist is dealing, as, for example, in John xviii. 7 ff. Jesus is there being sought by the high-priest's band, led by Judas, when they meet Him at Cedron, "that the same might be fulfilled which He spake, Of them which Thou gavest Me I lost none." The compiler of this method says: "It seems placed beyond doubt by this instance alone that the fulfilment so often pointed out in connection with quotations in the New Testament means simply the suitableness of an accommodation to an event of language originally applied to some other event."

Our fourth is the *Græco-Talmudic Method.* Its author [4] considers the Septuagint to be the most important book in the world. That alone was used by the New Testament writers, and used in an extraordinary

[3] Palfrey, *The Relation between Judaism and Christianity*, 1854, 183.
[4] Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, 1911, vi. and 396 ff.; *The First Christian Ideas*, 31 and 103.

manner. First, Acts xviii. 4 in the version of *Codex Bezae* is, " On entering into the synagogue every Sabbath-day he conversed, *inserting the name of the Lord Jesus*, and persuaded not only the Jews, but Greeks," etc. In this method the italicised phrases represent a new manner with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The Christian messengers and writers took the right excerpts from the Hebrew writings and inserted Christ in them. Thus a new system of interpretation was put in the place of the common Jewish Midrash. Second, the Septuagint supplied language and incident for the construction of the New Testament. We may find an example of this in the narrative of the agony and arrest and betrayal of Christ. This, he declares, is made from the narrative of the flight of David as it is found in 2 Sam. xv.–xvii. Such influence would give the Greek Old Testament a place unexampled in the history of religions.

Our fifth makes an approach towards the beginning of the *Anti-Judaic Method*. A well-known Old Testament scholar [5] has recently brought into relations with the Gospel text, and especially Matthew, the first notes of a new view. He says : " Another source used by Matthew seems to have been a collection of proof texts from the Old Testament and made for apologetic purposes and for the use of Jewish Christians. It was a kind of ' *Messianic florilegium*.' ' The composite Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, the early

[5] Box, *St. Matthew*, 24 and 76. He cites Moffatt, *Literature of the New Testament* [2], 23 ff. ; Burkitt, 126 ff.

Christian literature, from Barnabas and Melito to Cyprian's *Testimonia* especially, render it highly probable that *florilegia* and *catenae* of Old Testament passages were in circulation.' Probably such a *florilegium* was used by Matthew, which appears to have been written, in its original form, in Aramaic, for the use of Jewish Christians of Palestine. It was thus an Aramaic translation of certain passages of the Old Testament, but made apparently from a recension of the Hebrew text which was independent of the Masoretic. Matthew used it in a Greek form. This will explain the fact that the Greek citations made from this *florilegium* are independent of the LXX."

Elsewhere [6] the same scholar, after taking into consideration more of the literature which is concerned with this view, has foreseen that it will cause an opinion different from the accepted one on the relations of the two Testaments.

It is clear that if the fifth method has truth in it, then the preceding four do not call for more analysis. They will be set aside. The demands of discovery ought to be without fear, if they are right. We do not trouble at the demand that we should eradicate a habit of definition which has been passed down to us through the ages that lives for us now only on a tablet from Babylonia, or in the form of a god's name, or on a pictogram from Crete. We should then be able to excise from us any factor in religious belief which, with its short reign in our era, has prevented our understanding of Jesus

[6] Box in *The People and the Book*, 1926, 439 ff.

Christ, whose religion alone can release men and women from the hold of the ancient world on them.

The most direct way of approach to the problem of the Old in the New Testament is through the use of the verb "to fulfil" in the Gospel of Matthew. There the verb has two usages: (1) concerning the attitude of the mission of Jesus to the Old Testament; (2) concerning the use of the Old in the New Testament by means of prophetic citations.

The first of these points brings into question the authenticity of the passage Matt. v. 17, 18: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am come not to destroy, but to fulfil." Here we have fresh and frank help from the Talmud,[7] though this has hitherto not been noticed. Herein is told an incident in the life of Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. His wife, who was a sister of Rabbi Gamaliel, lived near to a Christian teacher who could not be bribed. Therefore she tried him with a golden lamp and said to him: "I desire that they give me a share in the family property." The teacher answered: "From the day when ye were exiled from your land the Law of Moses has been taken away, and the Law of the *Avon gillayon* (Evangelion) has been given, and in it is written: 'A son and a daughter shall inherit alike.'" Then the next day the Rabbi Gamaliel went to the teacher with the bribe of a Libyan ass. The teacher is said to have answered the question for him thus: "I have looked further to the end of the book, and in it is written, 'I am not come to

[7] *Shabbath*, 116a–b; see Klausner, 44.

take away from the law of Moses, and I am not come to add to the law of Moses'; and it is written: 'Where there is a son, a daughter shall not inherit.'" We will follow up the light this early story can throw on the Gospel text and leave its cynicism.

It is an early story, since Eliezer was born between 30 and 40 A.D.[8]; and the text of the incident, "From the day when ye were exiled from your land," shows that it must have occurred some time after the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore its attributed date "about the year 73"[9] is most probably accurate. If words mean anything at all, the answer of the Christian teacher shows that a "Law of the Gospel"[10] contained matter which had to do with questions of inheritance. The text of Matthew knows nothing of such things. The other Gospels do not permit of the surmise that perhaps Jesus had spoken on the subject. We know definitely that He refused to say anything on such matters. He had not come to legislate concerning them. For He had come to lead men and women out of the very fabric of Jewish social and religious thought, as out of that of Roman and Greek and Samaritan life and ways. Further, that this teacher could not have been using a document containing sayings of Jesus from which Matthew[11] might have drawn is certain when

[8] Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1905, 143.1.

[9] Klausner, 45; Herford, 148.

[10] That this title is not one which came from the Gospel or the revelation of Christ, compare, *e.g.*, Barnabas, *Epistle* ii. 6. He tells us that "the New Law of our Lord Jesus Christ" exempts men from the Jewish Law.

[11] Chajes, *Markus-Studien*, 1899, 39, believes that the original of the saying in Matthew is to be found in the second half of what the teacher read in "the end of the book." This view makes the Talmud right at the expense of Jesus.

attention is given to the text of the Gospel. For the words " Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments," in the first place, follow actually the Beatitudes and the sayings appended to them ; in the second place, they preface a " righteousness which shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees " ; and in the third place, these latter words are rubrical to the commandments of Jesus which follow them, and the least of which a disciple of His must not break. The hypothesis of a pre-Matthæan *Logia*, which recorded a teaching of Jesus on the inheritance of Jewish property, represents an historic impossibility, and a textual possibility which would save the face of the Talmud at the expense of the New Testament. For the words ascribed to Jesus as to the fulfilment of the law of Moses are an interpolation with Judaising tendencies from a document known to the Christians of the Dispersion. According to the Talmud, it was known as the " Law of the Gospel." We ought to be acquainted with the fact that the early great danger to the teaching of Christ was a tendency on the part of some of His followers to look back to the things from which they had come, and which to them seemed more substantial—for instance, to the geographical Jerusalem in the place of the city of God or to the tactual scheme of ritual practices and thought in place of perfection in the teaching of Jesus Christ. On such matters the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews [12] uses that most striking figure of speech which says as if with

[12] vi. 6.

fire that they who so do " crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh." Lastly, that these words are a Judæo-Christian interpolation [13] is upheld by new findings concerning the genesis of the document known as the Sermon on the Mount.[14]

This instance of the use of the verb " to fulfil," which has been raised to a determinative place in the history of theological thought for the maintenance of the continuity of the Jewish view of God, and for the crowning of the Hellenistic depravation of Jesus Christ, is seen on Talmudic evidence to be an element from a phase of Judæo-Christian thought for which only one defence can be made, namely, that it is human to go back to old ways of thought after times of crisis.

The second usage in Matthew of this verb " to fulfil " has in general been interpreted in the completed sense of the first usage ; that is, the Old was prophetic of the New Testament. But a fresh view comes into New Testament interpretation, as we have suggested, with the fifth method of dealing with the problem of the Old in the New Testament. That method comments on Matt. i. 22 ff.,[15] where is cited Isa. vii. 14, as

[13] Cp. Monnier, *La Mission Historique de Jésus*, 1914, 126 ff.

[14] See *infra*, Chap. IV.D.

[15] Box, 76. Other literature than that cited by Box on what is called " the fifth method " : Conybeare, *The Dialogues of Athenasius and Zacchæus* (*Anecdota Oxoniensia, Classical Series*, viii., 1898) ; Harris and Burch, *Testimonies* i. (1916), ii. (1920), where the first detailed study of the subject is made, and much of the germane literature discussed ; Ungern-Sternberg, *Der Traditionelle Alttestamentliche Schriftbeweis " De Christo " und " De Evangelio,"* 1913, 297 ff., laboriously treats the subject as if it had no concern for the first century, but was a controversial instrument to be used chiefly against Gnostics and Marcionites, he has not understood the genius of the mode ; Bindley, *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1917, *Interpreter*, April, 1918, *Expositor*, April, 1918, *Journal of Theological Studies*, March, 1921, has contributed to the growth of this subject ; Burch;

follows : " This formula, together with a similar one, is especially frequent in the First Gospel ; it recurs in ii. 14, 23, iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17, xiii. 35, xxi. 4 ; cp. xxvi. 56 : a similar one (' Then was fulfilled that which was spoken ') occurs in ii. 17, xxvii. 9. The editor, when he compiled the Gospel, may have borrowed those proof passages from a *Book of Testimonies*, or Old Testament passages which were regarded as prophecies of events in the life of the Messiah, and which had been collected and were current in a Greek translation of an Aramaic writing. The fact that these quotations are, to a large extent, independent of the LXX. makes it improbable that the editor was citing directly from the Bible. Where he does this he uses the LXX."

The list of Matthæan passages included in the above extract does not cover all in the Gospel which cite the Hebrew writings after a new fashion. These others are as influential for our understanding of the verb " to fulfil " as those where it is explicitly used. They are—Matt. ii. 2, " For thus it is written by the prophet " (Mic. v. 1 (2)) ; iii. 3, [16] " For this is he that was spoken of by Isaiah the prophet " (Isa. xl. 3 ff.) ; ix. 13, " But go ye and learn what this meaneth " ; or xii. 7, " But if ye had known what this meaneth " (Hos. vi. 6) ; xi. 10,[17] " This is he of whom it is written " (Mal. iii. 1) ; xv. 8 ff.,[18] " Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah pro-

St. Paul et le Christianisme Fondamental, 1924, contains other references to literature and to further exploration of genesis, influence and growth of the mode.

[16] Mark 1. 3 ; Luke iii. 4 ff.
[17] Mark i. 2 ; Luke i. 76, vii. 27.
[18] Mark vii. 6 ff.

phesy of you" (Isa. xxix. 13); xxi. 42,[19] "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures" (Ps. cxviii. 22 ff.); xxii. 32,[20] "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God" (Exod. iii. 6, 15); xxii. 44,[21] "How then doth David in the Spirit call Him Lord?" (Ps. cx. 1, viii. 7 (6)); xxvi. 31,[22] "For it is written" (Zech. xiii. 7).

Further there is an extraordinary application of this last short formula of introduction in the Temptations narrative: Matt. iv. 4 [23] (Deut. viii. 3); iv. 6 (Deut. vi. 16); iv. 10 (Deut. vi. 13). This narrative has yet to be interpreted by a true understanding of the use of the Deuteronomic excerpts.

Now these two sets of citations divide themselves into as many divisions: those having the several orders of introduction which belong to the birth and youth and crucifixion narratives and those which belong to the narration of the ministry of Christ. Among the newest results of the critical study of the Gospels are those which demonstrate that the birth and youth and crucifixion, in the expanded forms of the received Greek text, are documents appended to the original extent of the *Lives* of Jesus Christ. The new documentary explanation for those expansions is that primitive historical notes of those events have been given

[19] Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17.
[20] Mark xii. 26.
[21] Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42 ff.
[22] Mark xiv. 27.
[23] Luke iv. 1–13. The silence of the Fourth Gospel will be shown to be due to the dominance in its composition of the Gospel's primary document. My forthcoming book on this Gospel contains a number of new finds for its interpretation.

details and significances from the growing body of *Testimonia*. They are not then unhistorical additions to the Markan base of Matthew and Luke, as if by the ingenuity of the commentator New Testament events could be made out of Old Testament prophecies.[24] That is a simple consideration which will save us from those fantasies of theory which, on other sides of the study of Christian origins, have created literary and theological geniuses out of genuinely naïve followers and messengers of Jesus Christ. Both Matthew and Luke have shown themselves capable of touching the events with jewelled work, and upon a base of *Testimonia* material. History has gained certain literary detail ; it has not thus been given its power to be. This discriminator works cleanly. When we turn to that place in the close of the Gospel where the narration of the ministry passes into that of the last hours of Jesus Christ, then the *Testimonia* are used as in the opening of the Gospel. An example of this literary mosaic-work is to be seen where the narrative speaks of Judas and the purchase of the field ; here history is being underpinned by *testimonia* just as were the few facts of the birth of Christ.

The first instance of the Old Testament in Matthew offers us candid help for the difference to be drawn concerning its place in events before and after the opening of the public work of Christ. For Matt. i. 22 reads, " Now all this is come to pass that it might be ful-

[24] New Testament studies have suffered a good deal recently from the alleged psychological phenomena of first century Christianity. In the particular matter mentioned in the text, Selwyn, among modern English theologians, has taken it to limits which history cannot support.

filled which was spoken by the Lord[25] through the prophet." The Evangelist could not have chosen more lucid language with which to express the idea that the Lord had used the Old Testament in His own manner.[26] He chose and informed an excerpt from an Old Testament writer with a transforming message. The nature of this mode was a cumulative one. It could have none other. The probity with which it grew is attested by the whole of the New Testament. For there can be no doubt that the content of the teaching of Christ was unaltered whether the *Testimonia* was enlarged to give body to the few facts of Christ's birth; or took on larger literary compass, as in the instance of Jude, whose text (if the term can be allowed for the sake of clearness) included excerpts from Apocrypha as well as from the Old Testament; or gathered pieces from pagan writers, as in the instance of Paul's usage when speaking to a Greek audience.[27] The mode had no times of strange or individual growth, as its extant texts from the first to the sixteenth century show. Surely an extraordinary claim to be able to make for any sort of religious document with so long a literary life![28] But before we can pass to further statement about the principles of this method of handling the Hebrew writings we must inquire more closely whether it was Christ's or not.

[25] ὑπὸ Κυρίου—the rendering "of the Lord" is inadmissible. It is a theological rendering made in support of the notion that Old Testament prophecy is fulfilled in the New Testament. Cp. ii. 15.

[26] Harris and Burch, ii. 59 ff., for the place of Matthew's *testimonium* in the extant texts of *Testimonia*.

[27] For the first discrimination of variety and growth of the "mode," see Burch, c. iv.

[28] Burch, 7 ff.

That He had a way with the Old Testament which was not according to the ideas of the writers He used we sometimes realise, but we have hitherto failed to recognise that His way was integral to His message. Some illustrations will establish this point: (1) Matt. xiii. 14 ff. Jesus has spoken the parable of the sower; and His disciples ask Him, Why parable instead of direct speech? Jesus answers that His disciples may know the mysteries of the kingdom [29]; but to the Jews there is no such understanding. Then follows the Isaian *testimonium* (vi. 9 ff.), "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand." That this is Christ's way with Isaiah is certain because of the new meaning the prophet's words have found. That this new meaning is from the greater motives of His message is just as plain. The parable portrays the different sorts of Jews who hear His message and their reception of it. The reason for such varied qualities of sterility among them is that the teaching of Jesus was anti-Judaic. It is a formality of recent views on the literary relations of the Gospels which supposes that Matthew quotes Isaiah because the text of Mark [30] had suggested the words of the prophet to him. Mark makes use of the *testimonium* in his Gospel [31] where Jesus turns it so as to chide His disciples with having eyes and ears unawakened by His message. Also the manner of the phrase which introduces the Isaian excerpt shows that

[29] Burch, 59 ff., for new finds on this important designation. They will erase the Mystery-religion content which is given to it.
[30] Mark iv. 12; cp. Luke viii. 10.
[31] Mark viii. 18; see Harris and Burch, ii. 60.

the Lord is using it in His own way : " And unto them (*i.e.*, the Jews) is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah." For when a disciple used that mode, as Matthew does, he has the formula " that it might be fulfilled." This discrimination between Christ's own usage of the Old Testament and the disciples' use after Him of His mode is an important one if we would comprehend how His message was transmitted to us.

A second illustration will lead us to more knowledge of the qualities of Christ's mode. The parable of the vineyard and the husbandmen is common to the first three Gospels.[32] Each Evangelist has kept its *testimonium* (Ps. cxviii. 22 ff.), which expresses the particular lesson Jesus wished to teach. The parable only has meaning if this is given its power to illuminate. Moreover, it is just that light which is needed for the exposition of all the other passages in the New Testament writings which owe their content to that famous *testimonium*.[33] Its use there is too uniform and significant that the ideas it represents should be traced to Pauline or Petrine influences. Just so is its use in the Gospels too fundamental that its presence could be attributed to the choice of either of them. The parable ought to be called a parable of the revelation. For Jesus is portraying the reception the messengers of God have had at the hands of the Jews. And when the Son was sent—as a very ancient strain of text says, " His Son, the only-begotten" [34]—He too was killed that His

[32] Matt. xxi. 33 ff.; Mark viii. 1 ff.; Luke xx. 9 ff.
[33] See *infra*, p. 126.
[34] *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (ed. Conybeare), 93, appears to have

inheritance might be taken by His assailants. The revelation of Christ, *the Stone*,[35] caused the passing over of a kingdom, to which Abraham was the stone,[36] to a people who would found themselves on Him. The Evangelists remark that the Pharisees "perceived that He spake of them." This revelation was the Gospel of Christ; it none the less abrogated Judaism. It was never against Jew or Greek or Roman; but it was the profoundest opponent of the cults, thought and practices of the ancient world. When Christian thought awakes to that fact, the world will have gained its true view and teaching of civilisation. Jesus, then, speaks His own language of religion.

Another illustration may be chosen in Matt. xxvi. 56. Before Jesus was led to Caiaphas we are told how He cried to the multitude: "Are ye come out as against a robber with swords and staves to seize Me? I sat daily in the temple teaching, and ye took Me not. But all this is come to pass that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled." Mark xiv. 50 has "But that the writings might be fulfilled." It should be noticed that Jesus is not implying that He came to suffer as was foretold in the Scriptures; therefore there was no need for weapons with which to capture Him. The phrase "I sat daily in the temple teaching" is the significant complement of the closing sentence concerning His fulfilment of prophetic utterances. It is His message which

a text of the narrative that is older than the received text. Cp. Conybeare xii. ff.; an illuminating study on the collocation Son and Only-begotten or Beloved by Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1926, 113 ff.

[35] For attestation in *Testimonia* texts, see Harris and Burch, ii. 60.

[36] Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 160.

brings Him to Calvary. He has been declaring it daily, even in the temple, as the Gospels tell us. His mode with the Old Testament declared on more than one occasion, as the Gospels record, that the Revealer would be killed. Matthew's version of Christ's description of the material He thus used, "the writings of the prophets," is more accurate than Mark's, since it describes the sheaf of passages from the Hebrew writings which Christ had made prophetic of Himself.[37] Then they were fulfilled by His original use of them. This conclusion implies their necessary integrality in His revelation, and their evangelical anti-Judaism. The anti-Judaic, or anti-cultic, character of Christ's use of the Old Testament is a phase of the subject that demands some other illustrations. In an encounter with Pharisees and scribes [38] who urged upon Him the external "traditions of the elders," Jesus throws them into contrast, first, with the "commandment of God," which appears to be a designation of the whole Law, and, second, with the "word of God." [39] The emphasis of Christ falls on that phrase. Of course it is not a name for Himself, nor is it a synonym for the Old Testament. The phrase brings into sight the antithesis of the living oracles of God, which is Christ's own message, and their traditions. The *testimonium* from Isa. xxix. 13, which otherwise

[37] *E.g.*, Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* I. ii. 4, 10 and 11.
[38] Matt. xv. 1 ff.
[39] Matt. xv. 6, *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*. Most of the strength of exegetes has been spent on the truth or untruth of Christ's contrast in verse 5. Cp. Strack and Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 1922, i. 691 ff.

is unhistorical or rhetorical as to its point, takes on its proper values when its new, and the phrase's, " anti-Judaic " qualities are seen.[40] These are taken on into the teaching Jesus gives to the multitudes from incident and *testimonium*. We may not elide the originality of His message by omitting the factor which lent Him an idiom familiar to Palestinians to carry quite new connotations of truth into simple minds.

Other illustrations are in Mark ix. 13 and xii. 7. Both incidents are interwoven with the same *testimonium*. In one Jesus is eating with publicans and sinners. The Pharisees make question. He answers : " They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." In the second Jesus makes the temple subject to Himself in His message. He challenges the Jewish concept and practice of the Sabbath : " But I say unto you that One greater than the temple is here. But if ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice." This use of Hos. vi. 6 does not mean that Jesus is another Hosea. He has transformed Moses and Isaiah, but not that He might make Hosea to be His *alter ego*. The vision and nobility of Hosea we are certain about. We ought not to be less conscientious to value aright Jesus Christ. So in the ninth chapter we may not blunt the edge of Christ's sayings by supposing that He had not thought the Jewish leaders of religion to be of those who need no physician, and that the sick were only publicans

[40] Cp. Justin, *Trypho* cxl. 2.

and sinners. The sharp shaft of His saying is against them who would not understand that His teaching demanded what Paul called "a new man." Hosea, then, is not used for a hortatory purpose, but as a detail in and subdued to the teaching mode of His message. We see this with even more simplicity in the twelfth chapter of Matthew. For there the *testimonium* is filiated with the teaching of Him who is greater than the temple. The ninth chapter puts Hosea to the service of a teaching, the twelfth chapter into subjection to the Teacher. Both the prophetic and the ritual phases of Judaism are put aside by the profoundest form of anti-Judaism, the truth which Jesus came to declare to men.[41]

We must now turn to what is a more extraordinary document than any we have yet examined. The narrative of the Temptations is excellently attested by the first three Gospels. It is true that Mark's account is rather laconic. He states the fact of the Temptations; Matthew and Luke agree concerning the details. The fuller documents have the appearance of qualities without parallels in the text of the Gospels. This is seen by certain lines of its interpretation: where the narrative has been rendered in terms of trance; or of the sudden flowering of Messianism; or of reverie, as a gifted mind brooded over a field of battle where the soldiery of the ancient world had fought—with a total disregard for the history of theological ideas; or for the New Testament view that God can tempt no man; or for the

[41] Cp. Barnabas, *Ep.* ii. 5, 6 Harris and Burch, ii. 60–69.

prayer that Jesus Christ had taught His disciples concerning temptation. It is not possible on any theory of the development of His ideas to support the opinion that Jesus held views which Job nearly rejected and that James denied, who possessed a curiously unventuring mind. We have not to argue that Jesus might not be made over again by theological doctrine of a time later than the first century. History does that with sufficient authority. Our duty is to be as careful for the facts of Jesus Christ as we are, for instance, for those of Plotinus.

The place of the Temptations in Matthew attracts attention. For a few verses later in his Gospel he makes a notable statement of certain phases of Jesus's teaching.[42] It is not a preoccupation with him that he should set Him forth as Teacher. No one ought to be so insensitive as to say that Mark had that predisposition. And yet his Gospel begins with the teaching of Jesus Christ and His *testimonia* mode.[43] A like insensitiveness ought not to be applied to the Gospel of Matthew. Again, the Semitic and *visible* language concerning the Spirit has impelled interpreters unto many notions of deep theological meaning which the language of the Gospels cannot support, theories of a coming of Messianic consciousness, or of second birth into Divine Sonship, or of Adoptionism—theories which are due to influences external to the Gospels and

[42] See *infra*, Chap. IV.

[43] Nestle considered that we should read with the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* (*Expositor*, 1894, 458 ff.), which makes the Gospel begin with the words, "As it was written."

the first century. What John is said to have seen [44] can mean neither those theories nor even an inner experience for Jesus that induced exaltation or ecstasy. There can be little doubt that the Baptist is giving witness to what for him would be a more august form of inspiration than the older prophets knew. They were made prophets by the laying on of hands; He was recognised by God as having the power within Him. It is His Spirit [45] which drives Him into the wilderness. That Spirit is the voice of the authentic self of the One whose possession it is. The Temptations show that voice at war with its opposite. Its opposite is the embodiment of the cult ideas and practices He came to overthrow. The devil is always that for Jesus.[46] There are then three encounters in this war in the wilderness. They concern Judaistic wonder-working, Judaistic cults, and Judaistic empire. To these Christ opposes—life by the words of God, His God and the service of God. Now His Spirit speaks through three excerpts from Deuteronomy, the religious law-book of the Jews. They are not used in affirmation, but in antithesis. Since, as will be shown, we may not detract from His most original use of the Deuteronomic matter. Jesus makes them serve Himself and His message.

Again, the place given to the Temptations document leads to the recovery of further details of its anti-

[44] John, i. 33, is more careful here than other Evangelists.
[45] Cp. *e.g.*, *Susannah*, 24.
[46] There is a striking instance of this in His exclamation, when Greeks came to follow Him, that He saw Satan like lightning. This must mean Zeus as "lightning." The instance shows how the anti-cultism of His revelation bore the same against all old world religions.

Judaism or anti-cultism. The experience was said to have lasted for forty days and nights. A reference to the biography of Moses [47] shows " he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights ; he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten words." The period of the experience is the same in both narratives, and is a Semitism for a period of some length. But Moses heard Another speak : Christ spoke from Himself. Indeed, He turned the appendix of the Decalogue against its alleged author. This Temptations document is a picturesque preface to the Sermon on the Mount. It is historical as to its base. It may also have its shape, as given in Matthew, through a lively comprehension of the principal motives of the teaching mode of Christ's message in a time contemporary with the Teacher Himself. That understanding is so true and sharp that the document embodying it cannot have been later than Jesus. Matthew places it so that it tells of One who is greater than Moses just before He promulgates from a more delectable mountain than Sinai the New Law of His kingdom. We have no right to suppose that this literary setting was dictated by a transference of values from a *Life of Moses* to a *Life of Christ*. Nor is there any call to premise a Mosaic apocryphon which had been worked up into material of the Gospel. Even if the greater part of the Temptations document could be said to have no actual basis in the life of Jesus, it would be independent of any such

[47] Exod. xxxiv. 25.

formal mutation of Mosaic into Christian values. It would still represent most valuable and contemporary evidence of things we have lost to view. It is inevitable that we should have to wait until discovery comes to take us back to see them. For the influences which have compelled the course of Christian thought—early controversies ; alien schemes of speculation ; theological doctrine from the canonical relations of the two Testaments ; empire of ancient cult ideas and practices and not the least powerful among these and other influences the vanished sense of Christ's revelation—have been so strong that with most of us the *status quo* of theological or critical opinion is Christianity. Surely both history and man demand that we should understand Him in His own terms.

For the structural study of the New Testament writings it is certain that the *Testimonia* document, to name it as it is found in documentary condition, is the mode of the teaching of Christ, and as such is anterior to the text of the Gospels. Further, the above illustrations of its use in Matthew's Gospel show that by its help a native idea can be formed of the genesis of the Gospels. Mark is no longer the source of Matthew's citations from the Old Testament.[48] The greater facts of the life and principles of the teaching of Christ are more natural and potent factors in the composition of the Gospels than the theoretical primacy of Mark. The finding of the original form and character of the Fourth

[48] Cp. Massebiau, *Examen des Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Evangile selon Saint Mathieu*, 1885.

Gospel will perhaps have more influence upon views of the growth of the Gospels than any attempt here to formulate the groundwork of those views. What may be done for Johannine will also be done for Pauline doctrine. Neither will be proved to be intellectual or religious enlargements of the teaching of Jesus, since both will be shown to be in the unity of the first messengers of Christ. That unity was not one of formulæ which had been learnt. It was composed of the varied men's grasp of certain central historical facts together with certain inseparable religious implications. These were to one another as the obverse and reverse of a coin; hence they could be carried throughout the ancient world even by unlettered men and women. For they were always alive in the experience of the messenger, or could be given more abundant vitality either through filiated context with the gathered *logia* and acts of Christ or in the abiding fact of God. We have to remember as well that the folk of those days were not beleaguered as we are with rumours of opinion from pole to pole. No village then was a world's sounding board. The great lines of the message were graven on lives which had to test them against the commanding experiences of life, death, and the most imperious need to believe in the God whom Christ came to reveal. Such conditions can keep message and belief in that state of vital resilience which ensures its missionary unity and efficacy.

The broad characteristics of this mode were—(1) a choice of little pieces from Hebrew prophecies which

Jesus used in the service of His message; (2) these became an idiom native to the minds of His hearers which could carry His message into the humblest of them; (3) this mode, by its nature, was a cumulative one: therefore it grew in its number of proofs for the significance of Christ and with corroborative matter for the events of His life; (4) its anti-Judaism was as inevitable as its anti-Gentilism when a just appreciation is reached even of the lesser phases of Christ's message.

No historian who understands the first century would commit himself to the opinion that such a mode was a hard one, like our educational methods according to a programme. New ideas demand language for their assimilation. Jesus came among lowly people; there were then irrefutable reasons why He would choose language in which He could be understood. An esoteric doctrine in an initiate dialect belongs to Gnosticism; a universal message in most simple language belongs to Jesus Christ. This conclusion is based on exact evidence. It carries with it, as one of its major renovations in Christian thought, that Paul is the inheritor, and not the creator, of the universal message to Christianity,[49] since the great missionary has for the creative base of his teaching the teaching mode of Jesus Christ, with its original connotations. What differences in thought are between the Lord and His great servant are minor ones, and they spring

[49] I give new documentary evidence for this view in my book, which has had to be cited in the course of this chapter.

from the very natural difficulty Paul sometimes had in subduing his Jewish mind to what he called "the revelation of Jesus Christ." We have made too much of a surprising visitation to him on the road to Damascus and the alleged psychic data of his thought: we have forgotten how Paul was made a messenger of Jesus Christ in the naïve manner of the first Christian societies—by a disciple's hand on his head, it was thought, the voice which could speak the things of Christ was given him; and by conference with other disciples the *principia* of Christ's mode and message were conveyed to him. And these *principia* were the things we have now found concerning the revelation of Christ.

CHAPTER III

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE FIRST WAY OF INTERPRETING JESUS CHRIST

THE New Testament writings are conscious of the fact that Jesus needs to be explained. We are over-conscious of that fact. They also know that Jesus interprets Himself. We seem to have lost hold of that fact. The elision of the second and the realisation of the first fact lead us to construct our five capital orders of Christological thought. They are—the ecclesiastical, the eschatological, the mystical, the philosophical and the theological. These mean that we compose a Christ by the efforts of the growing Christian society, or by the alleged supremacy of the Last Things in the thought of Jesus, or by the musing of the Apostles on certain of the facts of His life, or by the reconstitutive qualities of Greek philosophy, or by the thought and practice of the Hebrews raised to the powers of a theocratic scheme for the world. Thus the great personal creations from such Christological formulæ are—a distillation of a Master on high from the receding memories of a Master who was once on the earth; or a prophetic figure precipitated from an unearthly ethic which a falling world would enthrone; or an embodiment of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah,

if the mysticism is Peter's ; or a glorified genius who was something of a peasant and something of a Rabbi, if the mysticism is Paul's ; or the essence of a peasant-mystic who had long since lived in Palestine and had been given new life through the terminology of Plotinus ; or the abstraction of Semitic sacrifice seen in the context of the Gospel narrative. In turn these creations have their nuclei of form in certain names for Christ—for the first order : Messiah or Christ, Son of Man, Servant, Son of God, Prophet, Lord ; for the second : Son of Man, as Daniel spoke of Him ; for the third : Suffering Servant (Peter), Lord Jesus Christ and Heavenly Man (Paul) ; for the fourth : Logos, Son (in the Trinity) ; for the fifth : Saviour, Redeemer, Advocate, Judge. Ambient about these quasi-personal figures of the Christ are certain external stimuli. The figures would never have got their lease of life in the mind of Europe without them. For Europe has been mother of them all. These Christs were never in Palestine. A figure is not born in the Near East, we ought to know, because a name and a theory for Him are put there. For the first of these Christological persons owes more to a Cyprianic theory than to all the simple assemblies of Christ's followers in first century Palestine ; and the second to folk-beliefs which Luther never made quite German, because they were mediæval Latin and before that immemorially Semitic, rather than to the documents which tell how Christ utilised such beliefs ; and the third to a doctrine of redemption which had bloomed

as a chief theory in the criticism of the Old Testament, and not to Petrine documents—to the ancient Eastern myth of a redeemer-god which was clothed upon with a Galilean mystic who is a creation of critical hypotheses, and not to Pauline documents ; and the fourth to Greek writers, who in defence of the historic Christ adumbrated the Logos-Christ so as to isolate the Fourth Gospel from history, or to Augustine, who did the same thing in a harsher language under the spell of Neo-Platonism ; and the fifth to the universal powers of invasion into the pages of the New Testament which European official thought has granted to the Old Testament. We have known for centuries Christology ; we have not known Jesus Christ. It would perhaps have been wonderful if we had recognised little more than those foreign superstructures of definition. The regnancy of Christology in place of Him has been preferred both theoretically and practically. We may not, however, follow at present these wider considerations, but return to the several modes of Christology that we may see the deepest reason why they have supplanted the Person.

It has been pointed out that the nuclei of these modes are in the use of certain names for Jesus Christ. They have been set out in order. They are very familiar names ; and they may seem to most of us to be parts of the very texture of the New Testament. The technique of Christology has passed into those names which are the chief components of the language of religion : Son, Lord, Messiah, Redeemer ; these

and similar names have become for us Christianity. We speak them, and the content they have in our varied Christologies holds our spirits, so that we rethink the New Testament in their terms, with complete unconsciousness of the fact that its message and its regnant personality may be other than they. There is a plain duty, then, to inquire into the use of the nuclear names in the Christologies we confuse with Jesus Christ.

In the *ecclesiastical order of Christology* [1] there is a sextet of names. These are the bones of a new structure in the history of Christianity. To the message of Jesus was added a doctrine concerning Him; that is Christology. The centralisation of the followers of Jesus in Jerusalem and their strong need to turn Jewish ideas into Greek terms constituted the two main influences for the change from a local prophet and teaching into a scheme of ideas which would express him as the ground and head of the Christian community. We will take the six names in turn so as to exhibit the whole of the scale of values which has been at work to compose this order of Christology.

(i.) Thus for Messiah or Christ: its Markan usages [2] are in the title of the Gospel: "the Gospel of Jesus Christ"; in Peter's confession: "Thou art the Christ"; in Jesus's answer to John that a Jew was with His followers if he gave a cup of water: "because

[1] For this view see Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1920, i. 345 ff.

[2] i. 1; viii. 29; ix. 41; xii. 35; xiii. 21; xiv. 61; xv. 2. This order of Christology is prone to very late dates for the New Testament writings.

ye are Christ's" ; in Jesus's question to a temple audience : " How say the scribes that the Christ is the Son of David ? " ; in a discourse by Jesus on the end of the age where He warns against others who may come with the cry : " Lo, here is the Christ " ; in the question of the high-priest : " Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed ? " ; and in the mocking of the high-priests and scribes during the Crucifixion : " Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross." Mark, then, recognised this name as one used of and by Jesus. The Evangelist's record of the answer to the Petrine confession : " That the Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected," shows that he considered Jesus to have substituted the idea of a Suffering Christ for a political Messiah, whilst the question to the temple audience shows that, though Jesus was the Messiah, He was not the Son of David.[3] Therefore the Markan tradition displays a Jewish-Messianic connotation for the name with an earlier tendency to link itself with the Son of Man and a later tendency to add Son of David. This Christ or Messiah was a Sufferer, and not a Ruler. When, however, the editors of the Acts and Paul use the name, they do so as a proper name for Jesus, which in the instance of Paul is used conjointly with Lord to bring out its Jewish colour. The change here is more of *locale* than of content. The earthly Jesus with Messianic enrobement has only been set in a Græcised heaven.

[3] Cp. Mark x. 47, xi. 10, which are Jewish usages of the name.

(ii.) For Son of Man: this is allowed to be a name used by Jesus of Himself. In the Gospels it is put on His lips, and not in narratives about Him. It is said to occur in the Acts once, in Stephen's address,[4] and never in the Epistles. There are two principal usages of the name. The first has *Parousia* connections,[5] and the second has filiations with the *Passion*.[6] A third usage, which is said to have rather dim significance, is noted where the original meaning "seems to have been 'a man,'" or a periphrasis for the first person. The *Parousia* relationship is justified from parallels in Jewish Apocalypses.[7] This is considered to be the most primitive point of the name in the Gospels. The Jewish apocalyptic meaning became merged into that of a Son of Man who should suffer. This shift in meaning is held to be due to Greek Christians who did not know the primitive significance of the name. Jesus had died before this change in style was made in the name. Therefore Isa. liii. is a later proof and not prophetic of the event.

(iii.) That opinion also defines a part of the significance of the name Servant, since it is argued that Isa. liii. is only a shadowy influence in Mark x. 45: "and to give His life a ransom for many." The Suffering Servant is not then a creation from Isaiah, but out of the Psalms. The cry on the cross: "My

[4] Acts vii. 56.

[5] *E.g.*, Mark viii. 38; xiii. 26, 32; xiv. 62. Cp. Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30, 27, xxvi. 64; Luke ix. 26, xxi. 27, xxii. 69.

[6] *E.g.*, Mark viii. 31; ix. 12, 31; x. 33; xiv. 21, 41. Cp. Matt. xvii. 12, 22, xx. 18, xxvi. 24, 45; Luke ix. 22, 44, xviii. 31, xxii. 22.

[7] *E.g.*, Dan. vii. 9 ff.; *Enoch* xxxvii. ff.

God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ? " which is from Ps. xxii. 1, is held to be the warrant for that conclusion. Further this Servant does not suffer that many may be saved. That also is to be seen from the Acts,[8] where the historic fact of crucifixion is not alluded to except in Acts viii. 32, which is the incident of Philip and the Ethiopian keeper of the royal treasures who was reading in Isa. liii. This difference, as it is said to be, is because in the non-Isaian use of the Servant the Jerusalem of Jewish tradition peeps out, whilst in the Isaian use the Cesarean or Hellenistic tradition is seen.

(iv.) For the name Son of God : the two earliest references [9] to this name, as the compilers view the New Testament sources, are said to be so corrupt [10] that they should serve as " a warning to remember that the Gospels, as we have them, are Greek." That is to say, something that was essentially Jewish has become something Græco-Christian. Jesus, it is claimed, never used the name. Either extra-natural or supernatural agencies use it, like the demoniacs or the " voice from heaven." If the high-priest used it, he had trumped up a charge against Jesus ; if the centurion had used it, he spoke a pagan title.[11] As the idea of the Father is regarded as Jewish, so also must be the idea of the Son. Where Matthew introduces the phrase " My Father " into the sayings of Jesus, we

[8] Acts ii. 22 ff. ; iii. 17 ff; vii. 51 ff.
[9] Mark xiii. 32 ; Matt. xi. 25 ff. ; Luke x. 21 ff.
[10] On the second passage cp. Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 189 ff.
[11] Cp., *e.g.*, Mark i. 11, ix. 7 ; iii. 11, v. 7 ; xiv. 61 ; xv. 39.

should see the work of his Greek editor; therein, as in all the references, the Jewish connotation has been lost.

(v.) For the name Prophet: this is said to be Samaritan rather than Jewish, a peculiar outcrop in Acts iii. 18 ff. or John i. 21, which, though it looks like Deut. xviii. 15,[12] most probably represents a Jerusalem tradition shaped by another from Mount Gerizim.

(vi.) For the name Lord: a Greek *Kyrios* name has supplanted the earlier name Rabbi,[13] the Galilean or Judæan tradition, by the intrusion of the fundamental idea in Græco-Oriental thought.[14] There was an intermediate or Antiochian tradition which called Jesus *Maran* or Sir.[15] From a simple teacher or person to be respected He is made into "the Lord of a circle of initiates who worshipped Him." That is said to be Pauline doctrine, and therefore the basis of catholic belief.

We must sum up our findings as we proceed with the analysis of the names in each of these orders of Christology. The energies in the nuclei of the first order are—(*a*) A regularity of oscillation between Jewish and Greek, primitive and transformed, tradition; (*b*) The Jewish tradition is assumed to be confined to the actual history and teaching of Jesus, whilst the

[12] The Deuteronomic phrase is: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet in the midst of thee." See Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 1925, 203 ff., on Moses as prophet.

[13] This opinion is arrived at by emphasis on the textual priority of Mark.

[14] Böhlig, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1913, 28 ff., has rightly shown that this name on ancient coins and inscriptions is a Divine title. See thesis in Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913.

[15] Cp. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, 1924, 43.

transformed tradition is asserted to be the result of the Jewish tradition making itself at home in the growing community and among Greek conditions; (*c*) The definitive influence is the union of Jewish ideas with Græco-Oriental cults.

A single name dominates *eschatological Christology:* the Son of Man. Its source is in the prophecies of Daniel,[16] and its setting in the thought of the Last Things which filled the mind of Jesus. It is said that He considered Himself, or that He was considered by early disciples, to be the embodiment of the One to whom may be given the kingdom in the Danielic vision. His message was as fire, an eager, unworldly ethic which became desolate when no world's end came. But, phœnix-like, this faith has raised itself from its own ashes to burn in men's minds with the message of a kingdom and an end somewhen in the process of the world's history. The energy of this nuclear name, the Son of Man, is in that last austere vision.[17]

Mystical Christology, with its names Suffering Servant and Lord Jesus Christ, is split into two main expressions which are ascribed to Peter and Paul. Peter's form is claimed as being older than Paul's in that it was one of the creative factors of the great missionary's belief.[18]

[16] vii. 1 ff.

[17] See closing chapters in Schweitzer. Monnier, 73, supposes that the name Son of Man remained either little or misunderstood by the primitive Church. He draws this conclusion from the infrequency of its use by others than Jesus. There was little reason for others' use of it, but that was because of Christ's individual use of it. See *infra*, p. 109 ff.

[18] Bacon, *Jesus the Son of God; or Primitive Christology*, 1911, 81 ff.

The Petrine addresses in the Acts and First Epistle of Peter are not based on the vision in Daniel, but on " the Isaian figure of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh " —a view, it is contended, that occurs elsewhere only in the prayer of Clement of Rome, in the prayers of the *Didache*,[19] in the prayer of the Martyrdom of Polycarp, and a fragment from the writings of Apollinarius on the Paschal Victim. A select and striking line of witness, if only it were the whole, and exactly interpreted. This Suffering Servant has no quality of preexistence. He was born by an apotheosis. On this view even the text of the Gospel of Mark, where it records the confession of Peter at Cæsarea Philippi, is convicted of " conformity with his (that is, Mark's) systematic attempt to antedate the Divine Sonship of Jesus." [20] By the bridge of light in Peter's inner vision the man Jesus, with his dreams of Jewish Messiahship, passed over to be the outline of the Christology of the early Church. Calvary had its part in precipitating that vision ; but for Peter memories had returned of Jesus's teaching about the kingdom being within men, of God as the Father of men, and of doing His will from the heart ; and these were the agents which shaped the Christ as the Suffering Servant. They too tell us why that nuclear name has

[19] ix. 2, 3 ; x. 2, 3.

[20] Bacon, 95, attempts the distinction between a " confession of Christhood as meant by Peter at Cæsarea Philippi " (Mark viii. 29 ff.) " and Christhood as understood in the full Christian sense " (Mark ix. 41 : " For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink because ye are Christ's "). That is to say, Mark makes Peter speak for " the whole inner circle of disciples "—*i.e.*, the initiate's knowledge. It may be suspected that no distinction was in Mark's mind. See *infra*, p. 119 ff., on the incident.

energy in it so that men of to-day can make its resultant Christology the object of their worship.

The other type of *mystical Christology* is Paul's creation, and whose names are the Lord Jesus Christ and Heavenly Man. The first name is ubiquitous; the second is sparsely found, though its appearances are more numerous if the suggestion be accepted that it and the name Second Adam mean the same. To become the Lord Jesus Christ, a Galilean peasant, with religious genius, had to pass through the alembic of Paul's mind. The composition of the Apostle's mind as arranged by certain recent students is—(1) the Cilician predisposition to the ideas of a God who died and rose again: this was induced by the worship of the nature god *Sandan* in Paul's native Tarsus [21]; (2) the Pharisaic superposition of the ideas of a transcendental Messiah, which it is thought he had learnt from Gamaliel [22]; (3) the Judæo-Hellenistic composition [23] in which Philo, Plato, contact with new cults in his missionary journeys and the use of many-coloured Greek are the principal ingredients. Then through the Damascus vision these three states of mind became fused into Paul's object of worship. Its primary nominal formula was the Lord Jesus Christ, its secondary the Heavenly Man. This latter is an offshoot of the former—a Jesus sublimated from Mid-

[21] Böhlig, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsus im augustinischer Zeitalter*, 1913.
[22] *E.g.*, Bricka, *Le Fondement Christologique de la Morale Paulinienne*, 1923, 17 ff.
[23] Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligion*, 1910, 54 ff.

rash on Ps. viii. [24] or Dan. vii. [25], a Pharisaic creation. The strength of these two types of Christology, with their many lines of paternity, is in the claim that together they form the heart of official Christian thought in Europe. It does not appear that consideration has been given to the view that they may disable Jesus Christ, in many ways, from coming out to men and women as He was.

The names Logos and Son (in the Trinitarian sense) belong to *philosophical Christology*. Of these only the first calls for analysis, since the second is patently anachronous. The Fourth Gospel is the source of this Christology, not its Prologue [26] only, but the whole document, which is said to portray a new view of Christ in terms of Logos philosophy. This Johannine view, as it is often called, is looked upon as the last stage in New Testament thought. The Oriental, and even Græco-Oriental, Christologies are supposed in it to be surpassed by those who imagine that Plato and Plotinus are "without spot or wrinkle" from the Orient. And where there is a feeling that the Gospel was written in that watershed of Eastern things, Asia Minor, there it is argued that its writer had always his eyes on the Occident, so that he rendered the Christ in a language of universal terms. The limits of Galilee passed into the limitless world, and the short years and

[24] *E.g.*, Bacon, 83; margin to Nestlé's text of 1 Cor. xv. 27.
[25] Bricka, 17.
[26] *E.g.*, Harnack, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1892, 189 ff., has made a division between Prologue and Gospel in behalf of a false theological value of the Gospel.

work of the Galilean took on the timeless robe of the Logos. It is easy to see that the energy of this nucleus is second only to that of our last order of Christology.

Theological Christology has created its names by means of a system of ideas whose foundation is deeply laid in the Old Testament. Its attitude appears to be, whether in its Catholic or Reformed schemes of enclosing doctrines, that the nominal nuclei and their connotations are inexamined and inexaminable, if Christianity is to live and grow. That opinion raises a frequent dilemma for most of us in Europe ; and it as well imperils that candid realisation of who and what Jesus was which truth, as much as the future of our religion, imperiously demands of us.

We have been viewing these nuclear names as Christologies ; let us look at them now as lists of names. When they are thus compared with the text of the New Testament, they present certain defects.

There are, indeed, some cardinal defects in these lists of names which go beyond the above reasons for their compilation. Not one of those lists is a skeleton of the New Testament. A man might have a most sensitive knowledge of that book, but he could not reconstruct from one or all of them the main facts and ideas of Jesus Christ. They do not stand for Him : they represent theories about Him. For not one of those lists is made by a compulsion original to the New Testament writings. The literary priority of Mark's Gospel, the hypothesis of Q, the pervasive influence of Paulinism in the New Testament writings, the

Hellenism of the Fourth Gospel—a number of other compulsions might be added to these which are as distant from a potency which could create any portion of the text of the gospels as council or creed and Catholicism or Protestantism. The first of those types of influence is alive until discovery comes, and the second is dated by controversy. The misfortune for the study of Christian origins is that at the present time both criticism and dogmatism are claiming finality of view. Further, none of the lists, nor all of them, represent in an adequate way the names of Jesus. Each is made on a selective plan. Its moment of making is usually the rise of this or that critical theory; its material is always the nominal adjuncts of the theologies. They are not adequate to the New Testament writings. We might make them such by assuming that if the names, in each and all of the lists, work out to the recorded results, then the rest of them could only contribute to those results. If these lists are made to carry such a flexible etcetera of application for their results, it must follow that they have tenuity of sanction even less than has been found for them. On the other hand, they do make a positive contribution to the method we must adopt in the study of Jesus Christ and the origins of Christianity. They have seen somehow that in the first century the names for Jesus explained Him.

Now a nomenclature, even if it is very naïve, must have behind it a cause or causes. If a list of names is related to a personality, as it was in the first century, then that personality, if in any sense he was a teacher,

would have told to those who listened to him the genetic group of his names or the ideas which fashioned them. So simple a vehicle for the conveying of the meanings of himself or of his teaching would not arrive in the second stage of a religion.

That stage might add to the number of the names or embroider the first ideas; it might not devise the alphabet of the religion. Among the lists of names we have examined there seems to be an awareness of that historic order, but also a lack of awareness of feeling that such an order, with its recognition of simple and less simple qualities, was not to be evoked by the views which had created those lists. The original *naïvetés* in use and content of those names could not come out at their touch. The whole process was too grown up and alien to do that. Is there any way back to the simplicities which enshrined the first things of Jesus Christ?

To find that way back we cannot do better than to agree, on the intuitive side of them, with the above lists of names—that there must have been *an architectonic group of names*. It will be well also to realise that we shall not get to it by seizing upon those names which have been thrust into prominence by their facility of adjustment to Apocalyptic. We have been eager to prove or disprove their values in *being;* what we have achieved is the extinction of their values in revelation. Our Christologies can contain high or low views of the former; but the historic Christ *is* the latter values. We have to make the attempt to get to Him.

Recent Christologies have applied their intuitive feeling for an architectonic group of names to Matt. xi. 25 ff. and Luke x. 21 ff. as its likely source. The Lukan version reads : " In that hour Jesus (rejoiced in Holy Spirit (*a*) and [27]) said, I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them to babes. Yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight. All things have been delivered unto Me of (My (*b*)) Father, and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, and who the Father is except the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son revealeth." This version causes most readers to take the passage in the sense of Alexandrine Christianity. The revolt of the critical sense against such a reading is right ; but it must not be carried to the point of a *tour de force* which denies the orthodox handling of the passage and yet assesses its text in the same terms, because it has not

[27] The bracketed phrases marked (*a*) and (*b*) represent deletions to form the Q version of the saying : Harnack, *Sprüche*, 189 ff. ; see also Bacon, 2 ff., Jackson and Lake, i. 395 ff., who say : " It clearly employs language which resembles the Johannine and later Christian usage, and is quite different from anything else in Mark or Q. It is very improbable that it is an accurate representation of the mind of Jesus, or of the earliest Christian thought, for nowhere else in the earliest strata does Jesus appear as revealing God to those who are ignorant of Him, nor was that the message of the disciples to the Jews. It does, however, exactly reflect the attitude of the earliest Greek Christianity, such as is found in Paul's speech at Athens." In a footnote they refer to Harnack's attempt to rewrite the text as an heroic but unsatisfactory effort. These writers are in error in classing the passage as Johannine. They appear to postdate the writings and ideas of the New Testament at the bidding of the theory concerning them which is most advanced. On the passage compare Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, 1919, 545 ff., who sometimes throws out the balance of his excellent scholarship by dogmatic considerations ; Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers*, 1891, 100 ff. ; Chapman, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1909, 552 ff. ; Schumacher, *Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu bei Mat.* xi. 27 (Luke x. 22), 1913.

found the first meaning of its words. The late tendency of work on Christian origins to deny that Jesus Christ brought any revelation to men accounts for what is now almost a stereotyped opinion : that we have no reason to seek any other than pleasant or jejune or nobler Judaism in the sayings which Greek redactors have profoundly altered.

If we leave aside metaphysic and look to revelation, we shall find that the words have simply to do with the message of Christ, its reception by simple people and its discriminative disclosure. When, too, we turn to their context, we find in Luke that the Evangelist has appended a saying confirmatory of our reading of the words. The " prophets and kings " [28] who had been denied the revelation were Jewish leaders. The contrast between the " babes " and the " wise," those who had followed Jesus, brings out the same emphasis. Matthew has another saying which, like Luke's, has the right to be appended here because it crowns what Jesus has been saying. The first Evangelist records the appeal : " Come unto Me." Christ pleads for learners. His revelation and its anti-Judaism are vividly pictured in the contrast of the two yokes. That is how Paul [29] and Barnabas [30] and the *Didache* [31] knew them. And the two yokes have passed into later texts of the anti-Judaic teaching mode of Jesus.[32] Both content and context give the name Son the primary value of the Son

[28] Luke x. 24.
[29] Gal. v. 1 ff.
[30] ii. 6.
[31] vi. 2.
[32] See Harris and Burch, ii. 34 ff.

as Revealer—One whose revelation is essentially anticultic.[33] These two facts must indissolubly go together. They constitute the reason for the first name, we have found, in the architectonic group of names.

There are but two other names in that group, Father and Spirit, as Jesus understood them. That is the tiny first alphabet of Christ's revelation. It has but to be made a little longer by means of the sub-architectonic group of names, and we have the whole of the alphabet of His language of religion, which says for men what other vocabularies cannot even attempt to say. Before we can determine these we must look closer into the ruling group.

And a question concerning the name Son presents itself at once: Do the Gospels show it, in any large measure, to have this revelational connection as an essential phase of meaning? An answer can be found, if we confine our inquiry to the accounts of the ministry of Jesus Christ. This is not done because Mark begins there. Neither is it an accepted theory of control that as Mark has few references, therefore larger usage is due to Greek editors and speculation. There is a simple consideration which ought to have its place in any estimate of Mark's Gospel, if that document is to

[33] Harnack, *Sprüche*, 210, 1; cp. Bacon, 4 ff. Harnack follows Pfleiderer, who finds a parallel between Luke x. 21 ff. (Matt. xi. 25 ff.) and 1 Cor. i. 19–21. These admirable students of the New Testament have missed, however, that the constructive factor in the Pauline statement is an anti-Judaic *testimonium*, Isa. xxix. 14; cp., *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho* xxxii. 5, xxxviii. 2, cxxiii. 4. It is only therein that the parallel between Jesus and Paul is to be found. Certainly there is no Paulinism in Christ's saying, for the disciple has but applied the teaching mode of his Lord. Bricka, 53, rightly makes Paul depend on Christ for the parallelism, but he is not aware of the influence of the *testimonium*, implicitly in Jesus and explicitly in Paul.

be accepted in any sense as the record of Peter's reminiscences, that Peter is a most unlikely person to have understood Jesus in an exacter way than the rest of His disciples. If, again, the Gospel is Petrine, it would have to show the density of Peter's mind with the teaching of Jesus. The choice of *logia* on Mark's part could not disregard the manner of Peter's memory of incident and saying. There need not have been a conscious keying down of the *logia*. That is the sort of thing a writer would do in these days. Such artifice is not in Mark's work. What colour is there he has taken on quite naturally from his informants. The theory that Mark took on colour from the teaching of Paul is rendered more than usually impossible if it is true, as certain critics affirm, that the paucity of references to the Father in Mark represents the primitive tradition [34] in Christian thought, for that carries with it the alleged primitive restraint of reference to the Son. Such judgments arise from the formal working out of the present foundations of Synoptic criticism, and not from the text of the Gospels.

Then the evidence of the Gospels will be taken, within the limits of the accounts of the ministry of Christ, wherever they show the original notes of the three names. Two of these names are inseparable, Father and Son,[35] if we are to arrive at first meanings. A possessive pronoun before the name Father may have other light to lend us than the opinion that where it

[34] Jackson and Lake, i. 402 ff.

[35] On name Son of Man see *infra*, p. 109 ff. The singular place given to it in recent Christologies demands special treatment.

occurs, there we have sure evidence of the Greek editors' work and their *flair* for metaphysic.

We have already adopted this method of dealing with the two names in our examination of the passages to which others have given a singular importance in Christological discussions ; and we have indicated that its primary significance is for revelation and not for metaphysic. The same conclusion was found for the visionary utterance of John the Baptist. The "voice from heaven" did not declare the adoption of the Son [36] ; but that was John's way of saying that Jesus Christ had the powers of His revelation direct from God. The Temptations narrative yields the same significance : its point is not in *being*, but in revelation. The Son with the unique chrism is the opponent of the embodiment of the ancient world's religious ideas.

It is of peculiar interest to pursue our texts for this primitive stratum in the names Father and Son in the Gospel of Matthew, for so many are inclined to the opinion that it, with the Fourth Gospel, bears the marks of metaphysical editing.[37] Even the statistics of the usage of the name Father are said to be plainly demonstrative of this fact.[38] But numbers miss the genius of the Gospel. Words can be counted ; but what puts them together, with the tendrils of their meanings, cannot be counted. It conveys nothing to us to know that the name Father occurs fourteen times

[36] There is very much new evidence against the theory of Adoptionism in the first century.

[37] *E.g.*, Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, 1923, i. 434 ff.

[38] See Jackson and Lake, i. 402.1, for tabular arrangement and their conclusions.

in the Sermon on the Mount.[39]. But a cardinal quality pervades that name when we learn that all those instances, except one, stand for the Father of those who have believed in the revelation of Jesus Christ. The exception is where He uses the name " My Father " ; but, again, it is the Father of His revelation. It will be recalled that the Lord's Prayer comes in the Sermon. We revive an original motive, in that prayer which subdues us all, if we note in it the motive of the revelation. When the disciples were taught to pray that the Father would not leave them in " the temptation," and that He would deliver them from " the evil one," then they were taught to pray for help against the embodiment of their old beliefs which Jesus overthrew in His temptation.

The next cluster of usages is in Matt. x., where the disciple is told that when he is taken because he does not follow Jewish or Gentile cults he must be untroubled, for the " Spirit of the Father," [40] that spoke the revelation he believes, will also speak in him. The successive usages tell of the exquisite care of the Father of the revelation towards those who believe [41] ; and Jesus tells how those who believe shall receive recognition before the Father in the life after this.

That we should achieve our search in this matter without repetition, attention should be called to the following outstanding instances : to do the will of " My

[39] On the Sermon see *infra*, p. 128 ff.
[40] On the Markan and Lukan phrase " the Holy Spirit " see *infra*, p. 83 ff.
[41] The Gospels know nothing of the rabbinical sentimentalisation of the sparrow metaphor (Matt. x. 29) ; cp. Strack and Billerbeck, i. 583. On the ethical qualities of the revelation see *infra*, p. 127 ff.

Father" is to follow the revelation, and that makes men and women the brethren and sisters of Christ [42]; the recognition of the Revealer by the Father as *the Son the Unique* in the Transfiguration [43]; God is the Father of those who follow the Revealer.[44] All these illustrations, severally and collectively, mark as the primitive stratum in the names Father and Son the relationship of Revealed and Revealer.

Do the specific usages of the name Son of God uphold that conclusion? The *logion* in which Jesus celebrates the "babes" who have received His revelation and the Temptations narrative are instances of support. What say the Markan instances? They are not many; and, as we have seen, their paucity has led some critics to doubt the primitive character of the name. Mark has the "voice from heaven" twice; and we have seen its filiations with the revelation. The demoniacs use the name.[45] This has been made into a problem. We are sometimes inclined to forget that Jesus came into a Palestinian world, with its Enochic type of folk-lore, especially as concerns cosmology. It would have been a literary miracle, which should not have happened, if Mark had written his Gospel without that cosmological matter. His portrayal of the healing

[42] Matt. xii. 50.

[43] Matt. xvii. 5. On title see Turner, *op. cit.* This incident has been curiously mishandled by interpreters. Wellhausen's view, for instance, seems to be a way of escape from explaining Christ, when he argues that the incident is a primitive Resurrection narrative. Turner has seen one of its great matters, which is that Moses and Elias are set in evident contrast with Jesus Christ.

[44] Matt. xxiii. 9 ff.

[45] Mark iii. 11; v. 7.

work of Jesus must be in its terms if the document is an historically authentic one. That diseases were demons then is as certain as that the strong winds were also demons. It was inevitable that they should be given voices, and equally inevitable that it should be said of them, " When they saw Him, they bowed before Him." We separate the " Wonder-worker " from the Revealer. The two must go together in the mind of Jesus's disciples, and His own. The " signs " were expected of the prophet in the Palestinian world.[46] It is the Revealer at work in an Enochic context which the Evangelist records. The familiarity [47] of the name Son to the contemporaries of Christ is a matter which cannot be overlooked. The two other notable Markan illustrations emphasise this last point. The high-priest did not invent the name in his indictment of Jesus before the Sanhedrin. He was but summarising the one reason for Christ's death at the hands of the Jews ; and that was His revelation. This same name appears in the centurion's exclamation at the Crucifixion. It has been explained away as having a pagan content. It is simpler and truer to see that this Roman had heard something of the teaching of Jesus which was crystallised in the name Son of God. The two Evangelists Mark and Luke supplement one another to ensure that conclusion. They both show the centurion using that name, with its anti-Judaic value and contextual refer-

[46] Jn vi. 14.

[47] Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, 268 ff., seeks to explain its unfamiliarity as a name for the Messiah. But a Messianic significance is altogether not required where Jesus is concerned.

ence to the *testimonium* whence it came.[48] Thus the Markan usages of the name Son of God, though innumerous, have the primitive significance and clearly indicate the teaching mode of Christ's revelation as the source of the name.

Before we can pass on in our statement to that revolutionising discovery we must seek to know if the third member of the architectonic group of names, the Spirit, harmonises with these two in their ground meaning. Already the answer to this problem has been pencilled in. We may begin to put in its details. The three details we have descried are—(1) The Spirit of the Baptism is God's Spirit of revelation, and what is even more notable is that in an intimate manner, of which we must seek the meaning, that Spirit is connected with Jesus so that He baptises His disciples into it. (2) The Spirit of revelation drives Him to and is the reason for His temptations. (3) This Spirit is God's self speaking. The first two of these details concur with the primitive significance of a connection between the names Father and Son. The third detail presents us with a conception which is older than the notion of a nexus with or effluence from or possession of a differentiated person out of God. These ideas arise from a special cause ; and each falls outside the first century. The importance of this earlier conception of Christian thought cannot be exaggerated. It lies still unrecognised in the narrative of the Baptism.

The rabbinical parallel to the " voice from heaven "

[48] Burch, 50 ff., and *infra*, p. 81 ff.

and the descent of the dove-like form is what is known as the *Bath-qol*—that is to say, the monitions of the prophetic spirit which were said to leave the prophet's mouth in bird-form,[49] or perhaps with bird-like sounds, a higher sort of ornithomancy. Sometimes this bird-borne prophecy was clothed in the words of the Old Testament. This is an enticing parallel. It seems to cover so many of the external details of the Baptist's vision. And yet to be satisfied with this as an interpretation [50] is to miss the whole point of the narrative. Jesus supersedes John and all that he stands for. Is then this " voice from heaven " the swan-song of the *Bath-qol*? It is to be noted that the Baptist daringly represents the bird-form as issuing from the mouth of God.[51] There is ample evidence that the " holy spirit " in the Old Testament and cognate literature stands for the essential being either of a god [52] or of a man.[53] When to these interpretative factors is added the last that the words which " the voice " spoke are, as John realised, utterly subversive of Judaism, we can see that the *Bath-qol* is not a parallel. The Baptist

[49] Cp. the catena of rabbinic references in Strack and Billerbeck, i. 129 ff.

[50] *E.g.*, Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, 1917, 47 ff.

[51] It is to be doubted that Gen. i. 2 : " And the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters," has any part in the literary creation of Matt. iii. 16, or that the symbol of the dove in Philo for the Sophia (see Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, 1909, 265 ff.) was its impetus.

[52] *E.g.*, Isa. lxiii. 10, " the holy spirit of Yahweh "—Theodotion had " the holy spirit of God " ; Ps. cxliii. 10, " Thy holy spirit," *i.e.*, God's in Lxx. version.

[53] *E.g.*, Sap. Sol. vii. 23 ; 4 Esdras xiv. 22. In the Psalms of Solomon xvii. 42 is the phrase ὁ θεὸς κατηργήσατο αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; this, Lebreton, 141, says, " proves that the Holy Spirit commences to be indivdualised." That is doubtful both as to the psychology and religion of the Solomonic Psalms.

may as a prophet have used the *Bath-qol*, and in a vague way he may have seized this vision within its familiar framework. But if that be so he has used it to express the unparalleled thing that God's very self spoke at the baptism of the Revealer. The more positive side of what the Baptist was saying, in his own way and not in ours, concerns Jesus Christ and will come out to us as we proceed with our examination of the names which were His in the earliest times. Our immediate task is to outline the powers and reasons for the architectonic group of names.

Their place in that group is based on the conditions of revelation, and not on union of *being*. They compose neither triad nor dyad. They have not been modelled on Babylonian ideas, nor made necessary because nearer Hellenic cults and the progress of religion demanded that Judæo-Hellenism should carry upwards the tradition unto ethical refinement.[54] With equal certainty it can be said that these were not chosen because of contemporary speculation about the *Sophia*, so that a triad of Divine and sapiential attributes should become a triad of beings, nor were they the outcome of Philonic influence—that *ignis fatuus* of commentators on the New Testament. The practical necessity of Christ's revelation was to say, in language that a child might understand, that the God was and is and is to be.

[54] Much speculation has been wasted on the alleged presence of the Trinity in the Old Testament. It is witnessed to, we are told, by Gen. i. 26. From Barnabas to Isidore of Pelusium, or from Ambrose to Fulgentius, evidence of this view can be shown. These catenae are good, but their value is improved if we will trace to what misuse the contents of ancient *testimonia adversus Judaeos* have been put to produce such a use of Gen. i. 26.

Father, Son and Spirit are the only A.B.C. of revelation. They composed the most simple and effective idiom of religion. It seemed to be what every one had spoken, and was sensitive enough to carry into all men's minds the burthen of the new connotations of the revelation. Those meanings were, however, so fresh and true and abrogative that Jesus was put to death because He was their Revealer. Talmudic depravation may hide that fact, but it is history. And we must get this right if perspective in theology is to be governed by the teaching of the Founder of Christianity.

Now of these three architectonic names two are God's and one is Christ's. They could, of course, have been chosen by a successor to John the Baptist, and their dissemination have become the glory instead of the derision of the Talmud. Instead, the Jews killed Jesus. Why? One of the chief reasons is in the use Jesus made of these names. The high-priest charged Him with being the Son of God; the centurion asserted He was the Son according to one Gospel, or the Righteous according to another. The source of these alternative names is in the *Wisdom of Solomon* ii. 13,[55] which is one of the fundamental *testimonia* in the teaching mode of Christ's revelation. Those names occur there one after another in the same phrase. We have been unsuspicious that this *testimonium* was the basis of much else that is of the heart of the New Testa-

[55] Burch, 37 ff. The remarkable influence of this chapter in *Wisdom* is pointed out for the first time in my book.

ment. For instance, it is the source of language and ideas to Paul's great Christological statement in Phil. ii.; it is the sole illuminant for that saying of Christ which theology has enlarged into a capital statement on the work of Christ (Matt. xx. 28 or Mark x. 45); and though Isa. v. 17 was transformed by Jesus into the parable of the vine-dressers, the meaning and names (those qualities which make it to be His parable) came from the teaching mode of Jesus, with its anti-Judaism.[56]

These are three illustrations, from the warp and woof of the New Testament writings, of how the architectonic name for Jesus, the Son, energises the ideas of those writings, and has its source in the mode of His revelation with the Old Testament and cognate literature. He uses excerpts from them, as we have seen, to be the familiar carriers of the unusual treasure of His revelation. He takes a little piece from Moses or Isaiah or Solomon; and the words are the same, but their content has been transfigured. Thus there comes

[56] Attention must be called to the Greek text of this parable, as it has been preserved in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* (Conybeare, 93 ff.). Conybeare, xiii. ff., who edited the remarkable little work, gave a detailed analysis of the text which, among its features, exhibits older readings than the accepted text, the omission of verses 17–32 in Matt. xxi. (which certainly read as if they were out of place), and a combination of the several versions of the parable which no harmoniser could have accomplished. Another most attractive suggestion from the Dialogue's text is where the writer moves on from the parable to the trial of Jesus, and writes: "for standing (*ἱστάμενος*; cp. Matt. xxvii. 11, *ἐστάθη*) in the place of judgment said only this, 'Behold, your house is left desolate.'" Conybeare thought that this meant the "only words uttered by Jesus." But the writer refers to the only *testimonium* spoken by Jesus. Is it possible that the cry "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem" (Matt. xxvii. 55 ff.; Luke xiii. 31 ff.) originally belonged to the scene of the judgment before Herod? Luke connects the cry with Herod, and in an unhappy context. The Lukan phrase "and He answered him nothing" has perhaps been transferred from the judgment before Pilate (cp. Matt. xxvii. 12; Mark xv. 5).

to view the revolutionising quality of this discovery, since it means that the nomenclature of the first way of interpreting Jesus comes neither from an Old Testament source nor from the Judæo-Hellenistic adaptation of earlier cult material to Jesus Christ ; but these names are from *a wholly original Christian source*.[57] Ancient words and names are put into a new context and in it their connotations become new. Jesus did not put aside the ancient meanings to leave the language of religion vacant. His death at the hands of the Jews and His subsequent treatment at the hands of centuries of Christians are proofs that both He and His revelation have unconquerable life in them.

It must be understood that we do not find the names for God, Father and Spirit, in the teaching mode. The name Son [58] is there. What, then, it is proper to ask, are the relations between Spirit and Son ? If in the Spirit we are to recognise the essential being of God telling its own meanings, how do the two meet in Him who is the Revealer ? Are we to conclude, with the narratives of the Baptism and the Temptations, that Spirit and Son are to one another as received and the

[57] The term " mystery," as used by Jesus and Paul, came thence. See Burch, 59 ff.

[58] In Greek *Testimonia* texts, *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho*, throughout with a variety of secondary titles ; Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae* iii. 41 ; Hippolytus, *Demonstratio adv. Judaeos* ix. (*P.G.* x. 793a) ; Jerome of Jerusalem, *Dialogus de Sancta Trinitate inter Judaeos et Christianum*, *P.G.* xl. 852a ; Gregentius, *Disputatio cum Herbano Judaeo*, *P.G.* lxxxvi. 648c ; Andronicus, *Dialogus contra Judaeos* xxxi. (*P.G.* cxxxiii. 884a). On the Latin side we may cite—Cyprianic *Testimonia* ii. 8 ; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 15,3 ; Evagrius, *Altercatio* iii. 11 ; Maximus Taur., *Tractaus V. contra Judaeos*, *P.L.* lvii. 794d ; Isidore, Hisp. *de Fide Catholica contra Judaeos* i., v. ; Fulbertus, *Tractatus contra Arianos* ii. (*P.L.* cxli. 312d).

recipient? We ought to be able to appreciate Semitic visual language in both those incidents. The inner possession or grace, which is perhaps how we should talk of it, is there seen and spoken of as if it were external to a person. We must allow the Gospels to record things in a way that is natural to such a man as the Baptist, and not make them and him to be products of modern and very complicated views of the psychology of the prophet. The *naïvetés* of both must be kept if we are to know their truth. Then it is suggested that there is a direct connection between Spirit and Son according to those narratives. An appeal may be made, for example, to two other passages in the New Testament on this matter. Matthew, as other Evangelists,[59] records the incident of the blind and dumb man with the accompanying Pharisaic criticism of Jesus. He claims to do His work in (not by) the "Spirit of God." And He tells His critics that they may sin against Him, and that sin be forgiven; but the unforgivable sin is blasphemy against the Spirit in Him. Let us recall again that doer and prophet, healing and revelation, go together in the minds of Christ's contemporaries. A later writer in the New Testament, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[60] enables us to view this matter from the disciple's end. He has grasped with a keenness of insight, that is coupled with remarkable tropical vividness, the fact of the supremacy of the revelation of Christ. By its means, he tells

[59] Matt. xii. 22 ff.; Mark iii. 22 ff.; Luke xi. 14 ff.
[60] vi. 1–6.

the dispersed Jewish Christians, they have come to participate in the Divine life, and have come into the knowledge of the teaching mode of Christ. They dare not go back to Jewish ways of belief and practice, since that is the unforgivable sin, by which they send again the Son of God to Golgotha and Calvary. Thus for him, as for the Gospel, there is a most intimate relationship between the Son and the revelation, and as well between Him and the Spirit.

The opening words of the Epistle to the Hebrews should have helped us straightway to that interpretation of the writer's hold on the teaching of Jesus. Language could scarcely make a clearer declaration of the fact of the revelation and of its great nominal feature, Son.[61] Nor could the writer have more simply put the foundation of the teaching mode of the revelation, since after the name Son he gives a tiny cluster of other names for Christ: Effulgence of Glory, Very Image, and Power. These are sub-architectonic names; and, as will be seen, come from a single *Wisdom* [62] source. They are not cited directly thence; they come from that source as it is used in the teaching mode of the revelation. It is evident that they have nothing to do with Philo. He uses the first and second names either as attributes of the Logos or of the human soul, as reflecting or bearing the imprint of the Logos.[63] Neither the doctrine of

[61] Heb. i. 2 has ἐν Υἱῷ—a certain indication of the names' familiarity. We have not to argue about an article to put before it.

[62] vii. 25 ff.

[63] Philo, *De Plant.* 18; *De Fuga* 101; *De Spec. Leg.* i. 81; *De Opific. Mundi* 146. Lebreton, 573 ff., has collected other Philonic references. With them he professes, as others have done, to see in the Epistle to the

the Logos nor Hellenistic influence in general is at work in those opening verses, but only the simpler, bigger things of the names of Christ made Christian in the manner of His use of literature before His time. Before we turn to define this *sub-architectonic group of names* we must face the position which our evidence presents to us, that the name Son, in the primary group of names, bears first of all some relationship with the names—Father and Spirit—which are borne by the God whom Jesus reveals.

It has been pointed out that these three names stand for the God who was and is and is to be. If we will use longer words, the names mean the pre-existence, presence and persistence of the God of the revelation. Let it be quite clear that these cannot refer to a God of man's growing apprehension of Him, of One who has been manifesting Himself with lessening dimness through the ages; this God is Christ's. Moreover, the name Son is borne by Jesus, who came into Palestine. The historic presence of Jesus and the God who is revealed by Him must mean more than the temporal coincidence of the Revealer and the Revealed, if the text of the Gospels, for example, has a shred of historical value. Their pages record that during His ministry Jesus forgave men and women their sins, and not as an inter-

Hebrews an Alexandrine production. But this view ignores the *Testimonia* source of the names in the Epistle. See, *e.g.*, Dionysius Rom., *Frag.* 1 (Routh, iii. 391); Origen, *Frag. in Ep. ad Heb.* (Routh, iv. 697); *De Prin.* i. 2, 5, 9, 10; Eusebius, *Dem. Evang.* iv. 3; Pseudo-Augustine, *Liber Sententiarum* xviii., *P.L.* xl. 731, *De Incarnatione Verbi ad Januarium* i. x., *P.L.* xlii. 1179, xiii. 1181; Demetrius Cydonii, *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, *P.G.* cliv. 893, where the last gleam of this *Testimonia* use can be traced in Byzantium.

mediary, with a delegated power to absolve human beings. Our theologies have made no room in their doctrines of man and God for that act ; but history has recorded it. Was He then only the mime of God ? Are the Gospels only a dramatic *Imitatio Dei ?* The narratives of the ministry have come through the fires of criticism, and that fact remains. No thoughtful mind can be content with the conclusion that in those acts of forgiveness Jesus was enacting how God had been forgiving men and women down through the ages. A part of His revelation undoubtedly was to proclaim that God had been working from the beginning on men and women. There are no temporal limits to the work of God in the revelation of Jesus, such as we apparently must have in our theological ordering of His ways. And the reason for the release from these temporal limitations—either from the theological prescription that the lifetime of a human being is the period of God's work upon him or from the evolutionary assumption that God has been revealing Himself through the ages of man's history—is not now that Jesus told men that God had been at work directly on men's lives, but that Jesus Himself was working directly upon them. And the very significant detail in these acts of forgiveness is that they were done before He was nailed to the cross. For Him to speak is revelation ; for Him to do the singular work of God is revelation raised to the powers of identity between the Revealed and the Revealer. The ancient New Testament idea of God manifested in the flesh describes this central feature of the Chris-

tianity of Jesus Christ. This, we should notice, is language of revelation, and not of incarnation. In the first identity of divine being can be maintained ; with the second segregation of being must be asserted. In the former " the Father and I are one " ; in the latter the Father and the Son must be two. With these values of revelation the dramatised *Imitatio Dei* passes away, and new historical sanctions pass into the text of the writings of the New Testament ; with the values of incarnation [64] we may give impetus to influences which have proved themselves to be disintegrative of its historicity, and of the true significances of the nomenclature of Christ's revelation.

What light do the sub-architectonic names for Jesus throw on Him and His revelation ? What illumination, for example, for the use Paul makes of those names ? We have found that this second group either branches from, or springs from soil near to, the primary group. The illustration from the Epistle to the Hebrews is a helpful one, since with the name Son are grouped three sapiential names : Effulgence, Very Image and Power. Paul has this last one in company with another, Sophia. Further, in Luke's Gospel Jesus explicitly uses Sophia for Himself,[65] and in a way that is synonymous with

[64] The small but valuable writing by Athanasius *De Incarnatione* offers an instructive illustration of the methods of fourth century thinkers. When he turns from the superstructure of Alexandrinism in the statement of his great subject, he turns to its foundations in anti-Judaic *testimonia*—from Chapter 33 onwards.

[65] xi. 49. See, *e.g.*, Cyril Alex., *Comm. in Joannem*, *P.G.* lxxii. 720a ; Matthaei, *Lucam*, *ad loc.*, where this passage has become a *scholium*. See also Hilary, *Comm. in Matt.* xi. 19, *P.L.* ix. 982b ff. Augustine makes an equation between the Sophia and the *Gallina* in Matt. xxiii. 37, *Enarratio in Ps.* xc. (Sermoi) 5 ; *Sermo* cv. 11. This must have been a fairly early

Son, who is also Servant, in the parable of the vine-dressers.

The artless propinquity of those names and their lucid association to form the structure of parabolic and gnomic forms of the teaching of Jesus should at least prevent us from schemes which arrange those names as if they were evidences of varying strata of the interpretation of Jesus. They jostle one another too naturally that they should represent most exquisite mosaic-work done by an unknown genius or geniuses in the period between the death of Christ and a hypothetical date for the earliest of the New Testament writings. This mosaic-work was as unknown to the first century as the literary geniuses. For when we turn to Paul, or to the Fourth Gospel, or to the Epistle to the Hebrews, we find that the names for Jesus have the same naturalness of cluster and fruit of meaning. To follow out these figures of speech, they are of one, and not of many trees; they are not by intricate engrafting, but by growth from the same trunk.

It will be well to remark here that this discovery, which authenticates first century thought, subverses all late thought, where the equal values and source of the names were forgotten. Let us take one chapter from the First Epistle to the Corinthians as a test of our findings and conclusions. In its opening chapter are three collocations of names for Jesus: (1) Lord Jesus Christ; (2) Son Jesus Christ our Lord; (3) Christ the

idea, for it has passed into early help for New Testament interpretation—Eucherius, *Liber Formularium* s.v., *P.L.* 1. 750d; Pseudo-Melito, *Clavis* s.v. (ed. Mai).

Power and the Wisdom of God. The natal name Jesus accompanies familiarly the architectonic name Son. And they with the same collocative right by others. The parallels from Hellenistic inscriptions, both as to gatherings of names and connotations, have failed to interpret them.[66] Indeed, the inscriptional collocations fail to cover all the names even in this chapter from Corinthians. Hence the syncretic scope of their contents has to be enlarged by views of religious influence from Persia and Babylonia, and those strange dwellers on the borders of the two countries, the Mandæans. Such lines of inquiry are valuable for the history of religions. The study of cult appellations for gods and goddesses has added immeasurably to our knowledge of ancient religions. Its material, however, can afford us only knowledge of the world of religious thought that environed Jesus Christ. It does not explain Him nor His names, and simply because it ignores or does not know that what names were chosen by or given to Him came from the teaching mode of His revelation with their significance made new and solely Christian. Then the three gatherings of names in the first chapter of the Corinthian Epistle share a quality in common : they were from a source, peculiar

[66] The conclusions of Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 1913, create a Christ who did not found the Christian religion. Another recent study, Böhlig, *Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus* (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1913, 23 ff.), makes much of the distinction between δεσπότης and κύριος on the basis of contrast between slavehood and vassalship. But compare Gregentius, *Disputatio*, 608, where the first name is shown to have synonymity with Son, Slave, God, Man. This is the right way back to the meanings of the names for Christ. Our present chapter is an endeavour to reconstitute their original source and values.

to the religion of Christ, in which, whatever the material, its content was transfigured by the revelation of Jesus. It is that source which yields the sub-architectonic group of His names. The primary name Son, for instance, asks for other names to spell out its meaning. Not that the teaching mode was inspired to be the instrument for invoking other names from or to go into Son, because it was a primary or compendious name. That name, as we have begun to see, means the historic present of the revelation of Christ : the presence of the manifested God, or the revealed *continuum* of the God who was and is to come. In part those other names are synonymous with the primary names Father and Son. The complement of that phase of their meaning is in what significance they draw from conjunction with Christ Himself. He who did on earth the deeds of God will also bear the name of God.

The God who is, has been and will be is spoken of in theological language in terms of pre-existence and persistence. Jesus uses names for these which shade off into Himself. No reader of the New Testament who has a true sense of language finds it impossible to agree with the equation Jesus Christ equals Spirit, whether in the " I come unto you " of the Fourth Gospel or " The Lord is the Spirit " of Paul.[67] And yet in each of these instances revelation

[67] 2 Cor. iii. 17. See Holzmeister, *Dominus autem Spiritus est*, 1908, for a review of the exegesis on this passage. Lebreton, 565 ff., has also a useful survey of such work. What has been missed by ancient and modern exegetes are very significant factors in this passage ; namely, the most lucid statement of the anti-Judaic or anti-cultic principle of the revelation of Christ, and of the teaching-mode sense of His name Spirit. Paul keeps

and being are so interfused that it is evident this language was not meant to convey the idea of a Divine dyad. It is the persistence of God, revealed in this novel and living way, that is the sole concern of work and Person in the revelation. It is just here that Christianity is unique, and shows its lovely ruthlessness of power to abrogate all the old world's religion. God manifests Himself in the flesh, and not only are the gods we describe as prehistoric or primitive overthrown: Jahweh as conceived by the moral genius of an Isaiah; Zeus as Plato or Epictetus had philosophically refashioned him; Augustan Jupiter, who in the poetry of Virgil seemed as if he might have forestalled the witchery, for all who are simple in heart, of the Lukan stories of the birth of Christ—these gods as well are swept aside, since He has revealed Himself who is God.

Do the other names for Jesus challenge this principle of use and source? The view that prevails to-day concerning them is that names which were ordinary titles of courtesy in the lifetime of Jesus were given Christological values after the Resurrection. Thus that event is said to have made Peter a theologian, since this view claims that after it he declares that Jesus was made

that name exactly in its "revelation" values. It is noteworthy that some early Latin Fathers, though Latin had contributed the problematical term *persona* to European thought, make this equation: Victorinus, *Adv. Arianos* iii. 15, *P.L.* viii. 1110; Ambrose, *De Fide* i. 87, *P.L.* xvi. 549; Jerome, *In Isaiam* xi. 1, *P.L.* xxiv. 144. The first of these early exegetes certainly knew and used *testimonia*. Thence came the equation of Son and Spirit. The attempts to translate this equation, known to Paul as "The Lord is the spirit which is the opposite of the letter" (Lebreton, 569; Toussaint, *Les Epîtres de St. Paul* i. 459; Prat, *La Théologie de St. Paul* ii. 225) miss what Paul meant. In this same Epistle, ii. iv. 3 ff., Paul restates those same factors, only this time he adds another name for Christ, the *Eikon* of God.

" both Lord and Christ." [68] This theory cannot stand before the historical facts. Peter's names for Jesus spring from a quoted *testimonium*,[69] that is candidly and outspokenly anti-Judaic. This is a pre-Resurrection usage both as to *testimonium* and names.[70] These names, then, Lord and Christ, come from the teaching mode of the revelation. That the first of them is used identically as we have found the name Son used is the only conclusion to be drawn from our texts. It is certain that Palestinian listeners would call Jesus " Lord " in their courtesy, and it would be just as natural for them to call Him " Teacher " (a synonym for Prophet [71]), for was He not engaged in religious teaching and exhibiting the " signs " of a prophet? But Jesus had His own values for the name, as the *testimonium* shows. These were they that post-Resurrection Christianity knew. The popular rendering of the name by *Didaskalos* is almost what it meant. Jesus evidently used it as equivalent to " Revealer," and with the distinguishing quality of One who is that in

[68] Cp. Jackson and Lake, i. 408 ff.; Burkitt, 47.

[69] Ps. cx. 1.

[70] Matt. xxii. 41 ff.; Mark xii. 35 ff.; Luke xx. 41 ff. Cp., *e.g.*, Barnabas, *Ep.* xii. 10; *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 81; *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, 69; Justin, *Trypho* xxxii. 3, xxxiii. 2, xxxvi. 5, lvi. 14, lxxxiii. 1 ff., cxxvii. 5. In the *Didache*, x. 6, is the phrase Ὡσσανὰ, τῳ θεῷ Δαυιδ. Editors incline to correct " god " into " son." Hemmer argues (ed. 1919, xcvii.) that the writer has altered the cry of the children in Matt. xxii. 42 ff. This suggestion is better than excision. The place of the phrase in the *Didache* depends on a Matthæan adaptation inspired by the *Testimonia* source for the names of Jesus. This matter has not been noticed before. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 1920, 373, compares the *Didache* passage with the Barnabas passage I have cited above. The Leiden scholar has shown very much of the *Testimonia* inspiration of Barnabas.

[71] *E.g.*, Matt. viii. 25; Mark iv. 38; Luke viii. 24; Matt. xvii. 15; Mark ix. 17; Luke ix. 38, etc.

word and being. Paul and all His first messengers [72] learnt this usage of Jesus Christ.

We may return to the Petrine statement for another sub-architectonic name for Jesus, Christ. It seems more difficult than with Lord to maintain the opinion that this was a post-Resurrection title. Peter couples it with Lord, just as Paul does. The *testimonium* which proves to be the source of the second is not such for the first name. We have, however, a long catena of *Testimonia* texts, from Barnabas onwards,[73] which yields the Christian literary source for the name. It means "the anointed." There is no transference of folk or Jewish concepts of kingship in this name. Since the *Testimonia* texts here show evidence of its independence of Hebrew text and Septuagint. That is one of its constant features. For it reads "Thus saith the Lord to the anointed, my Lord," instead of "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, Cyrus," with the Hebrew, or "to the anointed, my Cyrus," as the Septuagint reads. Neither cult nor political kingship is to be assumed as the motive of the name, nor the perfect flowering of the religious Jewish Messianic idea. It is clear from the special *Testimonia* version of its base that Jesus used the name Christ as another name for Lord; that is, as of a "Revealer" whose chrism is of the nature we have found. Paul's usage of the name Christ everywhere answers to this connotation.

[72] See further, on the Petrine speeches in Acts, *infra*, p. 112 ff.

[73] Barnabas, *Ep.* xii. 10; Cyprianic *Test.* i. 21; *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 7 ff.; Evagrius, *Altercatio*, p. 22 (ed. Harnack); Isidore Hisp., *De Catholica Fide* I. iii. 2; Fulbertus, *P.L.* cxli. 312d; Gregory Nyss., *Testimonia adv. Judaeos* xvii.

But what of the collocation Christ the Wisdom and Power of God? For the One who needed not anointing —and that is the simplest way of rendering the Baptist's vision—these names make excellent enlargers of the name Christ. They are both first century names. And both are admirably attested in *Testimonia* texts which reach from that century to the theologians of the very late Middle Age in Byzantium.[74] That steady attestation, which is shared by others of these names, is enough to show how they are to be appraised. It is certain that if an idiom of revelation came to be composed which was to win first of all the Palestinian mind, it would have to express the pre-existence of God by showing Him to be before the world was created.

The Wisdom literature represents the Sophia as being before the world was, or as being the beloved co-worker in creation. The Sophia, too, was another name for the Spirit of God which created prophets.[75] Thence also came the associated name of First-born,[76] which was creative of the cognate names Unique or Only-born. The *naïveté* of these names is matched by

[74] For the discussion of *Sophia*, see my forthcoming book on the Fourth Gospel.

[75] The idea of older Egyptian influence, in which creation is attributed to the magic power of words, is unnecessary. Loisy strongly inclines to this view. Cp., *e.g.*, Breasted, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumkunde*, 1921, 39 ff.

[76] Latin evidence alone is impressive—*e.g.*, Cyprianic *Test.* ii. 1; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 6.6, 8.14; cp. iv. 6.1, 11.7; Fermicus Maternus, *De Errore*, 18; Ambrose, *De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos* ii., *P.L.* xvii. 554b, 555a; Evagrius, *Altercatio* iii. 11; Maximus Taur., *Tractatus V. contra Judaeos*, *P.L.* lvii. 805a. The *Sophia* name is pendent to this in the Cyprianic *Test.* ii. 2. That, of course, is its proper place. An equal name, and not the ruling category.

their efficacy to speak certain great things to those who heard them. The new meanings they bore were bound to be appreciable by them, for they said the transfigured thing with such familiarity of speech. Thus the Sophia, as a name for the Lord Jesus Christ, did not convey that He was the Creator of the world, but that the God revealed in Him was its Creator.[77] The twin name of Power had its twin-like significance.[78] The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews gave Him to maintain by His word what had been created. That is most probably its original significance. Any one can see how it underlines the same values and truths of the revelation as Sophia.

These names lead inevitably to their more famous Sapiential companion, the Logos. That it does not indicate a refashioning of Jesus Christ and His revelation in the terms of Logos philosophy is soon to be shown. The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel can keep its literary structure even if each of the names for Jesus Christ takes in turn the place of the Logos. And,

[77] Cp. Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum* ii. 10, *P.G.* vi. 1064c, who rightly reads the names Spirit, Beginning, Sophia and Dynamis as names for Jesus Christ "testimonied" by prophets and others. Theophilus is, however, beginning to lose the values of these in the revelation of Christ. Lebreton, 112 ff., makes the same loss, because he has not grasped their source. Harris, *Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel*, 1917, 21 ff., loses their values because he attempts to make the Sophia precede the Logos, as representing a more primitive Christology.

[78] *Dynamis* is very early equated with another name for Jesus, which tried to express that the God revealed in Him was before creation, the *Hand of God*. This comes out, for instance, in Irenæus, who speaks of God having two creative Hands: *Contra Haereses* iv. 2, 5; iv. 20; v. 28. In the second of these instances, Irenæus further equates the two Hands with Word and Wisdom, Son and Spirit. Cp. *Demonstration of the Apostolical Preaching* (ed. Robinson, 1920), 74, 79 and 110. In the last reference, Irenæus quotes the prominent *testimonium*, Isa. lxvi. 1, for *Hand of God*. He certainly knew of the nomenclature of Christ and its source.

what is more important, the Prologue keeps its sense when those alternations are made. It could not be otherwise, since the material to compose it was made up of tiny metrical pieces from the teaching mode of Christ. Thus the name, as all the others, was informed with His revelation. Its connotations are no longer from speculation concerning the Memra,[79] or from the Philonic theory of a Logos who was the mythological mime of God,[80] or from Stoicism. The little document which opens the Gospel, wherein is more of history than has yet been acknowledged by its students, expresses without effort to define the coincidence of Revealer and the Revealed, which is summed up in the phrase " and we beheld His glory, glory as of *Only-born-from-God*." [81] The prologist knows and uses the teaching mode so that his material and the names for Christ have their proper interchangeability. When the teaching mode of Jesus passes into documentary form, the oldest text has the *testimonia* for the name First-born, Wisdom and Word (Logos) immediately following one another.[82] The oral practice, which is older than the Fourth Gospel, passed

[79] Cp. Strack and Billerbeck, ii. 302 ff.

[80] Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum*, 63 ; and *De Fuga*, 109, where Philo confuses Logos and Sophia.

[81] The italicised phrase means a name for Christ, and not a theological statement. We have to remember that First-born and Only-born are synonyms from the teaching mode of Christ. The compound name in the Fourth Gospel (i. 14) is a result of a quick *précis* of the Sapiential sources for the name First-born (Prov. viii. 22 ; Sirach xxiv. 3). In Justin, *Trypho* c. 2, is the statement : *πρωτότοκον μέν ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτίσματων.* Editors incline to annotate the phrase with " cf. Col. i. 15–17." Ought it not rather to be annotated with the two Sapiential sources ? Cp. *Trypho* lxi. : *ὅτι ἀρχὴν πρὸ παντῶν κτισμάτων.* Justin knows more of Sapiential literature than his editors have allowed.

[82] *E.g.* Cyprianic *Test.* ii. 1–3.

into the scribal order. They reciprocally attest one another, and confirm the prologist's understanding of and practice with the idiom of names in the revelation of Jesus.

Thus in the light of a new source, which has passed into the structure of the whole of the writings of the New Testament, fundamental changes are called for in our views of the Jesus who came into the world. These changes will restore Him to us. The Christ of minimum values, whether from theology, criticism or Talmudism, was not in Palestine of the first century. He is not recorded in the Gospels, nor did He create Paul. That Christ was a Revealer and that His revelation made the messengers and writers of the New Testament are the two greatest historical facts in the history of the world. With them and their recovery is enwrapped our knowledge of the God of Christianity and His ways with men. And the true way back to Him is through the names which Jesus gave Himself,[83] and whose number was added to, delicately and innumerously, by His messengers, who had learnt of Him, His revelation and its teaching mode.

[83] There is, of course, no formal list extant of these names. But a comparison of Justin's three lists—*Trypho* xxxiv., lxi., cxxvi., and *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 46, and Cyprianic *Testimonia* ii. 1–17—yields the result that in the last-named we have a close approach to the list which the first century knew, and their Christianised sources.

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND THE NORMS OF THE REVELATION OF CHRIST

A. *The Intruded Norms*

THESE are three : the concepts of the Son of Man and the Last Things, the meaning of the Kingdom and of its place in the revelation of Jesus Christ, and the quality of the content of that revelation. Late discussions on the problem of Christ have thrust upon them normative powers. Eschatology and ethics have enthroned them. For the first two have received controlling sanctions over the teaching and person of Christ through our recent and prevalent belief that the Last Things made Messenger and message, and the third from the contemporaneous tendency to define the content of Christ's teaching as being solely ethical. Neither of these ways with the New Testament material is novel ; but neither of them is carried out in quite the old manner. Our analysis of statistical motives in the various Christologies explains very much in them those powerful stimuli within and without their makers which arise from the European situation in thought, its genesis and growth. What is novel in them is their claim to have come to their conclusions by objective methods. This means that the process

has been conducted in isolation from the compulsions of inherited and co-opted ideas. We may realise what this ideal in question has yielded, if we set its results in contrast with received opinions on the subject of its examination. The objective figure of Jesus is that of a peasant who is a prophet, and whose dreams are of a swift end to the world, whose teaching is an ethic for the time that lies between his prophecy and this end. His Kingdom is of the stuff his dreams are made of, and with their durability. The adherents of this view give stern and mournful grandeur to the passing figure and his dreams by a visionary recurrency in a world's end which may come, and in the need for a contemning of the present world, such as Tolstoy taught. Indeed, if the set of Tolstoy's mind had not been so radically Græco-Russian, he could have put off his moujik's smock to put on the garb of that Galilean peasant.

There is another way of coming to much the same conclusions, and that is by means of statistics for the occurrences of the name Son of Man in Mark,[1] Q,[2] Matthew [3] and Luke.[4] Under these several captions the relevant passages are grouped as they represent Jesus speaking (1) in the first person ; (2) in relation to His Parousia ; (3) in connection with His Passion. For the significance of this numerical investigation, its

[1] (1) ii. 10, 28 ; (2) viii. 38, xiii. 26, 32, xiv. 62 ; (3) viii. 31, ix. 9, 12, 31, x. 33, 45, xiv. 21, 41.

[2] (1) Matt. viii. 20, xi. 19, xii. 32, 44 ; Luke ix. 58, vii. 34, xiii. 10, xi. 30 ; (2) Matt. xix. 28, xxiv. 27, 37, 44 ; Luke xxii. 30, xvii. 24, 26, xii. 40.

[3] (1) xiii. 37, xviii. 11 ; (2) x. 23, xiii. 41, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31 ; (3) xxvi. 2.

[4] (1) ix. 56, xix. 10, xxii. 48 ; (2) xvii. 30, xviii. 8, xxi. 36 ; (3) xvii. 22, xxiv. 7. On these tables see Jackson and Lake, i. 375 ff.

advocates turn to the occurrences recorded in Mark and Q; and where these agree, there Jesus uses the name so as to divulge its meaning. That comparison is said to lead to a primary conclusion that the name is used in connection with the Parousia. The secondary conclusion, which is from the peculiarly Markan usage left over from the comparison of Mark and Q, says that the name is connected with the Passion. And a literary conclusion, from the other three or four passages of these two documents' agreements, manifests that the name seems to have had an original meaning, that is " a man."

This statistical study, like others of its sort, has meanings which fit its tabular curves. The first personal forms of the name then take their significance from union with the Parousia and the Passion. Those related with the Parousia are said to have Enochic colour: a Son of Man is depicted who brings in the judgment before the age that is to come.[5] The identification of this figure with Himself means that Jesus had believed in the actual accomplishment of the coming, with all its wonders in the sky and on the earth. An earlier factor, however, enters into these meanings when the Son of Man is interpreted with the Passion. He is a suffering Son of Man, and that quality is not Enochic. This is understood as being either the creation of Jesus, who believed that He as the Son of Man would suffer, and that this belief was given substance by His followers from the figure of the

[5] Cp. Mark xiii. and *Enoch* lxxi.; see Jackson and Lake, i. 370 ff.

Suffering Servant in the second Isaiah; or a Messiah [6] who is a Sufferer made such by Christ's own usage of that Isaian source. These opinions make a coherent theory. Some of its advocates, however, appear to come to what is a simple view by making many obscurities in the text of the New Testament. Since objectivity of treatment is the aim of its advocates, it seems as if they ought to acknowledge that this plain way with the documents renders a good deal of the evidence obscure.

The meaning of *Kingdom* is coloured, shallowly or deeply, by the degree of prevalence that eschatological views have for students of the New Testament. Modern scholarship recognises that the phrases "Kingdom of God" and "Kingdom of heaven" are original to the New Testament. Thence outbranch six chief valuations for them, though certain falter back to supposititious phrases in the Old Testament as the literary sources of the New Testament designations. These interpretations will be classed as Talmudic, for they deal with the phrases in a similar manner to that which was used towards Jesus Christ in the Old Testament. They must be taken in turn to grasp their manners and results.

(1) *Mystical Talmudism.*[7]—On the basis of the apocalyptic vision in Daniel of "a son of man" who came with the clouds of heaven is raised the conception

[6] Some of the advocates of this theory do not emphasise the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. They follow Weiss's view that the powers of the Son of Man were conferred by the first societies of Christians: *Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes*, 1900, 40 ff.

[7] A representative of this view is Monnier, 182 ff.

of a Jesus who is inspired by it to assume the work of a greater John the Baptist. He is conscious that He is to usher in that reign of God which would overthrow the reign of Satan.[8] It is supposed that the "reign of Yahweh" has been mysticised into the "reign of God"; and that Jesus, the Son of Man, potentially represented its coming, though He prophesied openly that it could not be realised until He had died. Where the rabbis put the people of Israel in the Danielic vision, there this interpretation places Jesus.[9]

(2) *Neo-Talmudism.*[10]—Jesus as the Son of Man at first identifies Himself with the Danielic vision. Then, by the deepening of His Messianic consciousness, He breaks with the traditional view of a Messiah and spiritualises the idea of the Messiah's person and mission. Lastly, He transcendentalises that Son of Man into One who reigns from the heavenlies. Thus also His view of the Kingdom undergoes a triple ascent: from an apocalyptic kingdom—the heritage of Old Testament prophets—to a spiritualisation of that kingdom, a living epitome of whose energy was in Himself as He worked among the Palestinians; and on to the lasting transcendency of this kingdom in the heavens, with a final mutation by reason of the cross which closed His earthly life, and a necessitated change of name, which now became "Kingdom of heaven."

[8] Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 1900, 39, seems to have carried this idea to its extremity by the place he gives to the casting out of demons in the ministry of Christ.

[9] *Sanhedrin* 98a, *Midrash Tanchuma* 20 (70b); Strack and Billerbeck, i. 957, for other references.

[10] *E.g.*, Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 1892, 212 ff.

This Son of Man seated on the right hand of God is only a new way of saying what Daniel had said and rabbinical commentators after him. He has but been dipped into the iridescent waters of modern interest in psychology. That is the new note in this interpretation.

(3) *Parabolic Neo-Talmudism.*[11]—This valuation sees the Son of Man and His Kingdom in Jesus, as the rabbis saw them in the Danielic vision—the preaching and hope of a kingdom on the earth for the children of Israel. That this Jesus should have a message for to-day, the Messiah and His Kingdom are treated as parables of the progress of the world, the struggle, the agony and enthronement of the Kingdom of God. This Son of Man is the same figure as the Talmudists', only He is now put in the fourth dimension.

(4) *Petrine Talmudism.*[12]—According to this view, the Kingdom is equivalent to the brotherhood of men and women who believe that Jesus " has been divinely delivered from the power of Sheol, and would soon reappear as the Redeemer of Israel." This was the Petrine faith that made him to be " the rock," since he was the first " to promulgate the Gospel of God that Jesus had been ' designated as the Christ, the Son of God,' by the Resurrection." The criticism of this view will come in its turn, but it should be pointed out here that ordinary Talmudism is counterbalanced somewhat by the notion of the head of the community

[11] *E.g.*, Grimm, *Die Ethik Jesu*, 1917, 264 ff.
[12] *E.g.*, Bacon, 94 ff.

issuing from the place of the dead, a conception which, when given true values, can be claimed as being a New Testament one, but now placed in an Old Testament complex. The Kingdom, according to this view, concerns the company of those who believe in the resurrection of Jesus.

(5) *Full Talmudism in Outline*.[13]—The two designations present, according to this view, the strains of meaning which are found side by side in the text of the Gospels. These say that the Kingdom has come, is coming, and is conterminous with the society of believers in a glorified Messiah. The use of the three meanings shows that they duplicate three Jewish lines of thought concerning the reign of God. The three strains can be fitted to three earlier ones: Enochic,[14] Pharisaic,[15] and Jewish Apocalyptic,[16] and these three can be compendiously put under one label, Talmudic.[17] But this triple ancestry is not inked in. It remains in pencil. For the authors of this interpretation, when writing of the two designations, say that, though the idea represented by them in rabbinic literature is drawn from the Prophets, we cannot know "with certainty what the phrase must have meant in the Gospels." They may keep the Talmudic filiations of the term Kingdom in thin line, an achievement that is helped by their complex views on the text of the

[13] *E.g.*, Jackson and Lake, i. 377 ff.
[14] *Enoch* ix. 4 ff.
[15] *Psalms of Solomon* xvii.
[16] 4 *Ezra* xiii.
[17] Cp. parallels in Strack and Billerbeck, i. 175 ff.

Gospels ; but the conviction that all in the message of Jesus is Jewish is etched in with heavy line.

(6) *Full Talmudism as an Asceticism.*[18]—This is, of course, the Jewish interpretation of the term as it is found in the Gospels. For it Jesus is an extreme ascetic. His message is summed up somewhat in this way : " If the Kingdom of heaven is at hand it is worth while to sell all and buy the one precious pearl, the Kingdom of God. Nor need there be any scruple in receiving publicans and sinners and harlots, since the day of judgment would sift out the good from the bad, just as the fisherman gathers into his net good fish and bad, and only afterwards picks out the good and discards the bad." [19] This aberrant John the Baptist never explains the term. He is intent on the coming of the Kingdom, and careless as to its nature. For, indeed, the Gospel record of his views and its meaning " leave it quite clear that his notion of the kingdom of heaven and all that it involved differed but little from that of his fellow-Jews in the early *Tannaitic* period." [20] This view is a plain one and requires no comment.

Up to this point we have stated the various means whereby the concepts of the Son of Man and the Kingdom have become norms for us of the revelation of Christ ; we must now seek the reason for the rule

[18] *E.g.*, Klausner, 405.

[19] This is a supposed paraphrase of Matt. xiii. 44 ff. On the passage see *infra*, p. 117 ff.

[20] Cp. Klausner, *Die Messianische Vorstellungen des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten*, 1904.

of the third. The classical handling of the teaching of the Gospels forced that portion of it which could not be utilised as material for the theological expression of the redemptive work of Christ into an ethic of Jesus. Just so from that schematic division there have issued their personalisations into the heavenly Christ and the historic Jesus, the Saviour and the Peasant as Prophet. The classical handling begat the embodied doctrine of redemption and the embodied doctrine of morals. Attention has been directed already to the creative and inhibitive powers of inherited cult tendencies and theological definitions. These powers exhibit themselves quite clearly in the realm of Christian ethics. We may indicate with broad strokes the notes and reasons of their presence: the assumed prefatory function of the Old to the New Testament has made its God a first and Jesus Christ a second Person, the doctrine of inspiration has resulted in the extrusion of New for Old Testament values, and the ruling idea of Old Testament prophetism has made Jesus to be of the company of Jeremiah and John the Baptist. This triplicate of powers is sufficient to establish the two figures which are embodied ideas, and a surplusage of teaching which is a Jewish ethic of a type that is usual or unusual, according to the taste of the student. "The main strength of Jesus lay in his ethical teaching. If we omitted the miracles and a few mystical sayings which tend to deify the Son of Man, and preserved only the moral precepts and parables, the Gospels would count as one of the most wonderful collections of

ethical teaching in the world." [21] That is a Jewish estimate of the teaching of Jesus. It is as well a most interesting illustration of what is done, by way of explicit and implicit excision, on the part of one who is not a Christian. Jewish excisions equal Christian extrusions, as is proved by the resultant ethic. The Jew and the Christian join in their view of the theological and ethical precedency of the Old Testament; then the Jew talmudises both Jesus and His teaching, whilst the Christian talmudises Christ into a theory, and also the writings of the New Testament. The first is a conscious, and the second an unconscious, effort of the depreciation of values. Therefore the conclusion of the Jew " that throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the Old Testament, in Apocrypha, or in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus," is received as the objective judgment of scholarship by those who understand, and by those whose concern is the maintenance of received opinion in religion.[22] Both fresh knowledge and the troubles of men and women in our world of the twentieth century demand that the truth of this view of the revelation of Jesus Christ should be subjected to radical investigation.

[21] Klausner, 381 and 384.

[22] These last must ask themselves whether there is not truth in Klausner's opinion (396) that Christianity " *was forced to accept unchanged the whole of the Old Testament as canonical Scripture*, a sign that the New Testament alone did not suffice." The history of the Canon even does not support Klausner; but the course of later European thought goes far to warrant his paradox.

These are the three orders of control over our views of the teaching of Him who was the Founder of Christianity. His teaching has come down to us in documentary form. Then it always awaits the untimed appearance of Discovery, the pixie-spirit which gladdens and dazzles the awesome organisation of our scientific knowledge and hides we know not in what humble conditions. Is it not time that her bright presence moved over the records of Jesus Christ ?

B. *The Name Son of Man and its Use by Jesus*

This name is bound up with documents, so that we must make our approach to it through them. These, as we have seen from the tabular treatment of the name, concern the Parousia and the Passion. This simple division of the passages in which the name is, together with that which covers the first personal use of the name, has some textual warrant ; it therefore is fairly free from disposition by theory. We must then follow it.

When we come to analyse the first of these divisions, in which, it is said, the name is connected with the Passion, we find that it is artificial and inexact. The eight Markan passages which have been put under this head do not associate the Son of Man with the Passion only ; that name goes with a summary of the great things which are to happen to Jesus up to and beyond His resurrection. Further, these eight passages, with their Matthæan and Lukan parallels, are

found to have three different notes in their conjointure of name and reference. These forbid us to urge the Markan usage to one general and imperceptive view. Six of these eight passages unite the name with "suffering many things," rejection by the Jews, death and resurrection.[23] Their union in the close of the Transfiguration narrative is between the scene and the injunction that the disciples are not to declare what they have seen until the resurrection is over. The third note [24] is in the saying in which Jesus marks the equivalence of the names Son of Man and Servant, and their sources. These several notes do find union in one big fact: that which is to come to pass is the result of Christ's revelation. Further, the name is connected with the acquisition by the disciples of some great thing in the revelation of Jesus. At Cæsarea Philippi, and on the Mount of Transfiguration, the disciples gained glimpses of the essential factor in the revelation of Christ: the coincidence of being and words, or being and deeds, which constitutes the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. And in no less degree is the third note of Markan usage related with the revelation, though in what way will appear when we discover the source of the name in the saying which arose from a too large claim on the part of the sons of Zebedee. There is no reason to relate the name Son of Man with the Passion, but every reason for connecting it with the Revealer and His revelation.

[23] Two of these passages, Mark xiv. 21 and 41, because they mark one incident, the betrayal, in the order of the events of Christ's life.

[24] Mark x. 45; Matt. xx. 25; Luke xxii. 27.

There is certainly here no ground for the opinion that the Old Testament conception of the Suffering Servant was in the mind of Jesus, or in that of a hypothetical redactor of His thought.

The occurrence of the name in relation with the Parousia opens up the larger problem of its connections with the eschatological element in the teaching of Jesus. The presence of that element ought not to be doubted. It becomes, however, an authentic phase of His teaching as we find how He uses it. A great deal of recent discussion of this matter has been written from the opposite point of view ; it has been imagined that the task of the student of Christian origins is to find how eschatology had used Jesus Christ. Such a method was sure to end in remaking Him in its likeness. A figure of Him can be made with suave lines, and one which may suit the æsthetic demands of our times, a revival, let us say, of the Thorwaldsen ideal as a revolt against the Epstein caricature ; but fair speech and sombre apocalypticism is not substance enough from which to remake Him who makes the pages of the Gospels live. If the language of the Last Things is an authentic part of the religious speech of the first century, then we can only attest it by getting right Jesus's use.

In the first place, the chief eschatological document in the Gospels [25] does not record a Parousia, *but two Comings*. Its text candidly yields this important result. But it has not been allowed to guide us, nor

[25] Matt. xxiv. ; Mark xiii. ; Luke xxi. and xii. 31 ff.

has history. Hence we have missed the more important of His Comings. That of lesser importance was when the Romans overthrew Jerusalem in the year 70. Luke definitely records this with the phrase: "Jerusalem compassed with armies." He does more than this, and as definitely. He separates the apocalyptic material into two parts so as to define two Comings. The texts of Matthew and Mark have little uniting phrases between their two parts, which are evidently editorial additions.[26] The proof that in the second half of our document we have the statement of another Coming will ensure that conclusion.

The second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles tells us about the day of Pentecost.[27] On that occasion Peter spoke to the gathered peoples in Jerusalem. A comparison of the central motive of his address and the document of this other Coming of Jesus shows that Pentecost is the fulfilment of its promise. The factors of his address are—the Danielic vision of the Son of Man; the recital of the historic facts of Jesus's life; the repulsion of the charge of drunkenness from His disciples[28]; the clustering of the names Man,

[26] Matt. xxiv. 29: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days"; Mark xiii. 24: "But in those days after that tribulation"; whereas Luke xxi. 24 rounds off the first recorded Coming, and begins the document of the second Coming with the words "And there shall be signs." There is the possibility that in the references to "the tribulation" Matthew and Mark may be using a popular phrase for the time from Christ's death to the events of Pentecost, or it may have been a phrase which He used often to them concerning that period. Cp. John xiv. 1. "Let not your heart be troubled" looks like a beautiful synonym for the phrase.

[27] On the discourses in the Acts, see Burch, 86 ff., for new evidence for their interpretation.

[28] Cp. Acts ii. 13 and Luke xxi. 34, xii. 36 ff., and note how Peter in verse 41 rebuts the charge.

Lord, Christ; the overt use of *testimonia;* and the most plain anti-Judaic application of the whole discourse. Both choice of site and time are finally demonstrative of the purport of Christ's eschatological teaching and its fulfilment. There was small point in His prophesying merely the overthrow of the Jews by the Romans. He might thereby have claimed some political insight. He certainly would not have been on a higher level than the Delphic oracle. So also this other Coming could not have had much more worth if it had been but to prove right or wrong a prophet's apocalyptic genius. In neither Coming was He actually seen by men. He did not come on the clouds, nor did the stars drop, nor the moon hide her face. These things were accomplished in the use to which He had put the Old Testament, in His revelation and His inauguration of His reign. And His Comings were fulfilled in the deathless manifestation of the God who revealed Himself in Jesus Christ, when cult overthrew cult as Roman cast down Jewish altars, or as Pentecost put out for ever the lights of the Spring festivals of the ancient world. We have put off these Comings to some imagined end of the world. In like manner we have made Him as we will. But His Comings and Himself are apart from our ways with them. Nor are they made less sure because we have missed the powers of emancipation, in Revealer and revelation, from the world-old sovereignty of cults over us.

For the name Son of Man the same general con-

clusion must be urged for its connections with the Passion as with the Parousia : that the event does not affect the use or content of the name. A glance at some of the extant texts, which keep the most valuable evidence of the first documentary shape given to the teaching mode of Jesus, discloses that one of His names was *Man*,[29] and then Son of Man from the vision of Daniel. In other words, these names for Him come from the same Christian source as the rest of them. Also those two names are one as to meaning. What then was that significance ? We have two ancient interpretations which are worthy of study. A second century writer says [30] : " It was meant to show that He came and that He became man." An earlier writer made a simpler comment : " Man and God." [31] Both are near the truth. Let us recall the unique quality of the Revealer and the revelation ; that is, in Him and it was that coincidence of being and word which causes Jesus Christ to be the historic present in the revealing of God, who has been and will be. Thus the unity of the names Man and God will have said primitively what we have now deduced at length.

[29] *E.g.*, Cyprianic *Testimonia* ii. 9, 10, *Homo ;* Justin, *Trypho* lxix. 1, cxxvi. 1, cxxviii. 1 2, where Ἀνήρ ; xxxiv. 2, lix. 1, cxxviii. 2, Ἄνθρωπος ; lxxvi. 1, cxxvi. 2, υἱὸς ἀνθρωπου ; *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zaccheus*, 46, Ἄνθρωπος. Cp. also this name in other *Testimonia* texts : Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 13.10, " quo verbo etiam ostendit, sequidem, ut supra docui, ab unctione appellatus est Christus, deinde hominum " ; Maximus Taur., *P.L.* lvii. 796b ; Peter Damianus, *P.L.* cxlv. 45a ; Gislebert, *P.L.* clix. 1020b ; and Greg. Nyss., *P.G.* xlvi. 205a ; Chrysostom, *P.G.* xlviii. 815 ; Gregentius, *P.G.* lxxxvi. 656b, c ; Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae* i. 14, iv. 4.

[30] Justin, *Trypho* lxxvi. 1.

[31] I believe that it can be shown that the Cyprianic *Testimonia*, in its basic document, contains an exact reflection of the first century nomenclature, with its contemporary meanings. The parts in the whole are easily discriminable, as I hope to show.

Man,[32] or alternatively Son of Man, stands for God's revealing presence. Both names are taken from the use that Jesus made of certain pieces from the Old Testament. Thus they are both sundered from former literary and religious associations. This removes two disabilities from the interpretation of the Gospels: the disability of finding no sense in the name and the other of being compelled to find some sense for it by causing its content to say what Jesus did not mean. Further, we are relieved from the need which some have felt to shape myths of archetypal man for theology or cosmology or morals. The early chapters of Genesis had no part in the thought of Jesus Christ. And it is as plain that later Egyptian literature, with its world-myth and the Man, has not tinctured the language He used.

Though negative, these latter conclusions are of considerable importance, since they help to bring into view the other side of the originality of Jesus. He not only made the Old Testament and cognate writings serve His revelation, so as to form its potent little alphabet of names, but He also used the apocalyptic of those writings in the same re-creative service. He was of His date, as His material shows: He was Himself in His use of it, and always its master. The dateless message comes within the datable speech;

[32] Weiss, 53, has seen that the name ought to be related with a literary source; but he has overclouded its meaning, and is unaware of a "Christian" source for the name. Burkitt, 30 ff., put the name in the mists of Jewish Apocalyptic. Eschatology rules the connotations with which these scholars fill the name.

but as a sword to its scabbard, it was bright and single. He came, as He said, to bring a sword. And through the simple idiom of religion He used for its exposition we may recover its brilliant uniqueness and singular brilliance of grace unto life, if we will set ourselves to learn His alphabet. On it the scale of original values can be based for the interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. We may prove this by study of its imperial definers.

C. *The Term Kingdom and its Use by Jesus*

We must enter on that study by a level that will bring us to its heart. Nearly twenty years ago a document was found [33] which enables us to do just that. It is a rather neglected document. And the few scholars who have worked upon it have by no means exhausted its hidden treasure. The document is nothing less than an " Interpretation of the Parables " written in the second century. It comes down to us

[33] Schäfers, *Eine Altsyrische Antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn*, 1917 ; Burkitt, *St. Ephraim's Quotations from the Gospel*, 1911, *Evangelion da Mepharrashe*, 1904, ii. 189 ; Preuschen, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1911. These three studies or references were among the few that paid attention to the document until Schäfers' discovery. Harris then published his *Tatian : Perfection according to the Saviour*, 1923, in which he endeavoured to prove that the author of the Diatessaron was also the writer of the document in Armenian. But this opinion is based, first, on an equivalence of the title of Tatian's lost work (which we know from Clement of Alexandria) and a suggested title by Schäfers, which has no manuscript warrant. Second, his translation (though done with charm) is influenced by that ascription, so that Encratism is found in the document where it is not. Third, the *Bnai qyama* are intruded ; the anti-Marcionism of the document is ignored ; and the writing is optically set to accomplish its end by stressing unduly the few references to perfection, and especially of the sort Tatian taught. It will be understood that this summary is bound to be brief, and that its brevity alone makes its tone judicial. It is a precious document, and deserves more attention than it has yet received.

in an Armenian translation of the Syriac, and behind that lies a Greek original. Though it was written against Marcion, its pages are more concerned with the simple and positive statement of Christian things. Its writer grasped these things so that he showed his knowledge of primary Christianity in the first century. The value of this small writing increases when it is understood that in it we have guidance for the values then put upon the parables of Jesus, an instance of its remarkable helpfulness in a time of increasing literature on them, and wherein their values are being diluted away either by Talmudic or eschatologic valuations. These are among the new treasures to be discovered in the Armenian treatise.

" When we obtain the pearl of our Lord, that is, His commandments," or, again, " The treasure is our Saviour . . . revealed to us in this our time," are direct phrases of definition of Jesus as Revealer, and of the earliest exegesis of the parables of the pearl and hidden treasure.[34] And no one can fail to realise the time-note in the second quotation.

It makes an unequivocal authority for dating the document. The writer is so true to the ideas of the earliest Christianity that he speaks as if he lived in the time of Christ. Then, too, the definition of the Kingdom is strikingly fresh and simple. It is summed up for us in the document itself: " the religion of our Lord." [35] Let it be understood, as our citations

[34] There can be no doubt that this interpretation takes us to the heart of the other parables. Cp. Matt. xiii. 1 ff., xxv. 1 ff., etc.

[35] Cp. Fiebig, *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*, 1904, for

show, that this religion is not in abstractions or theological *précis*, but in the allied sense of the same coincidence of word and being which we have already demonstrated from the Gospels. With this stratum of meaning, we are far away from the formality into which the term Kingdom has been turned ; that is, into a synonym with the rabbinical usage of the term " Kingdom of heaven." We need this fresh meaning as one-half of the significance which Christ put into the word. It settles, for instance, that most controverted saying of Jesus about the Kingdom which comes, not by reading the stars, but is " among " or " in the midst of you." Jesus could invest Himself in that name, because of the fundamental unity we have found between Revealer and revealed, a unity which the Armenian document knows.

These things were also known to a first century writer,[36] who was nearly included in the Canon of the New Testament, where he said : " The Kingdom of Jesus rests on the tree, and those who hope in Him will live for ever." And he will act as a bridge between the two lines of meaning in Christ's use of Kingdom. The two are in his statement.

For, besides the meanings in the term Kingdom which had to do with Revealer and revelation, there was this other which had to do with the gathering of those who

Jewish introductory phrases to parables. Jesus has taken these and given them the light of new meanings.

[36] Barnabas, *Ep.* viii. 5. There is no real reason to suppose that Barnabas has more peculiarly rendered a peculiar reading of Ps. xclv. 10, as it is claimed, when Justin cites it : *Trypho* lxxiii. 1, ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. This is upheld by much Latin evidence from Tertullian onwards.

believed in them. For light on this concrete phase of the Kingdom's meaning, the assembly of the living, we must turn to one of the most discussed and misunderstood documents in the New Testament. The Matthæan account of what was done at Cæsarea Philippi [37] has achieved these distinctions. Theology and exegesis have thrust them on the passage. We have already shown that the opinions which make it to become a turning point in the history of Jesus or a record of intuitive primacy over the disciples for Peter have no foundation in the light of the fact that the disciple is using names from his Lord's method in teaching His revelation. From that point we should proceed to the reinvestigation of the other material of the passage. Its details are very familiar: Peter; the rock; the gates of Hades; the binding and the loosing.

Some nine years ago our mental placidity towards the passage was moved as by a wind which had found the unruffled waters of an enclosed lake, for a study [38] appeared which enlivened the discussion of its original text. There was a touch of novelty in this work, for it took us from the discussion of Peter to the "gates of Hades." It did more than that, for a way was being shown us by which to reach the roots of the difficulties in the Greek text.

We were told that gates were asked to do what they could not. It was against the idea of a gate to believe

[37] Matt. xvi. 13 ff.
[38] Bernard, *Studia Sacra*, 1917, 76 ff.

that it could advance. Such a fracture in metaphor was not in harmony with the most lithe use of imagery which is exhibited in all the sayings of Jesus. Then it was proposed to emend the word "gates" into "fountains" or "storms." That would mean the alteration of a vowel and a consonant in the Greek word for "gates"—the change of a Greek *e* (epsilon) and *g* (gamma) into a Greek *u* (upsilon) and *l* (lambda).[39] And the source of this suggestion was found in another saying of Jesus [40]; that is, where He speaks about the unavailing floods beating against the house built on the rock. There is an attractive congruity about this series of suggestions. It is a pity that it cannot grow into a series of conclusions. For though the metaphor of the saying is improved, its sense is made more than hard to understand. The place of the dead in the condition of flood or storm is unknown to literature, and seems as well to be only a daring imaginative impossibility. Also if any one will write down, in a Greek papyrus or uncial hand, the two words "gates" and "floods," and in the manner demanded by the above emendation, it will be found that patent objections arise from the side of palæography. Whilst the criticism of the phrase "gates of Hades" holds good, this alteration of the text introduces other problems at the bidding of another saying of Jesus, which only has a sort of mental metonomy with a feature in the incident of Cæsarea Philippi.

[39] That is, πύλαι into πηγαί.
[40] Matt. vii. 25, where is ποταμοί.

The problem is indeed a dainty one in the writing of early Greek papyri. During the first two centuries of the Christian era, when a writer wanted to inscribe on papyrus a final Greek *a* to a word, and particularly if that same letter was the first of the next word to be written, he made a short horizontal or tooth-like stroke over or from the head of the letter which was last but one in the first word. Now, if the Greek word for " gates " is written in that manner, we have *pulaia* [41]— that is, promiscuous or heaped-up gathering. Plutarch uses the word.[42] Where Matthew has an unusual word, there Plutarch is sure to be his nearest linguistic neighbour.[43] This emendation fulfils exactly the exquisite palæographical demands. Does it also fulfil the even more exacting demands of the thought of Christ ? The sense this word would yield is that of a massed congregation of the dead, in contrast to Christ's congregation of the living. It would at least be natural to expect that this saying should contain a contrast in assemblies. Is there any warrant in thought and literature for such a conception of Hades ?

It is in popular books. The *Book of Wisdom* [44] says : " All sleep the same sleep in the recesses of unreleasing Hades." Tracts for the people, which had Paul as hero,[45] tell how the Apostle is shown a hollow place

[41] Πυλαία.
[42] *Artaxerxes* I (ed. Döhner), ii. 1206 ; cp. Burch, *Expositor*, 1919, 219 ff.
[43] Cp. Matt. x. 33, xi. 44, etc., and Allen, *International Critical Commentary on Matthew, ad loc.*
[44] xvii. 14 ; cp., *e.g.*, Ps. lxxxviii. 5 ff.
[45] Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts*, 1915, 530 and 1059. This goes back to a much earlier original. Cp. the Latin *Visio Pauli* 32 ff.

where are " thirty or forty generations heaped above one another " ; and he weeps for the fate of " the whole race of mankind." This picture must have been based on the word we have restored to the Matthæan saying. Surely its conception is the spring of Paul's own cry,[46] " If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection out of the dead." Many books do not allow Paul to be human. He is made a superman, and has no league with the cosmology of his time. He was a prisoner to that first ; and then he became the captive of hope to Jesus Christ. Is there witness contemporary with Jesus and Paul for such cosmology together with the pendent ideas of binding and loosing ?

Again, we can delve in books for the people, and this time in a classical example of its kind. The Palestinian conception of the triumph of Hades over life and man has its full expression in the *Books of Enoch*. By fortunate circumstance a large portion of this work, where it has parallels with the text of the New Testament, has been preserved in the original Greek. This portion is notably taken up with Enoch's visit to the place of the dead.[47] He is shown three valleys. One is a place of darkness, where the judged sinners are imprisoned. A second is a place of quiet life for the righteous, though even they cannot escape its hold. Of the third it is said : " And this was created (for the spirits) of sinners when they die and are buried in the earth, *and no judgment has befallen them in*

[46] Phil. iii. 11.
[47] *Enoch* xxii. 10, 11.

their life. Here their spirits are separated for this great torment until the great day of judgment; . . . *the requital of the spirits shall bind them there for ever*." [48] A little later [49] in *Enoch* comes the declaration that the " congregation of the righteous " shall judge sinners on the earth, and that their judgment shall be effected in Hades.

Enoch offers us not merely parallels: we have there the sources of the material Jesus used to weave into His saying. Here are binding and loosing, and the literal likeness of the Matthæan and Enochic verb [50] for the latter function cannot be argued away. Here too is the *ekklesia* of the righteous exercising a function of judgment on the earth which holds in the place of the dead. The contrast of this Palestinian folk belief with the use of its literary material by Jesus is apparent: *Enoch* knows a binding which takes effect in the place of the dead, and a loosing which can put a man in the place of dim light to hope that a deliverer might come; Jesus speaks of a binding and loosing which operate " in the heavenlies." Just as the Palestinian or Judaic notion of an *ekklesia* of the righteous is changed into an *ekklesia* of those who believe in Him and His revelation, so also are men's minds lifted from the gloom of the place of the dead to the sphere and rule of immortal life. This change is not of a cosmological pessimism into a cosmological optimism. To believe

[48] For *ἀναπαπάδοσις*; Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 1914, 66, 1, is followed.
[49] xxxviii. 1 and 2.
[50] Matthew, *δήσης*; *Enoch*, *δήσει*.

in Christ and His revelation in the first century meant life for men and women ; and not to believe in them meant the way of death for men's personality. When Jesus called His followers " Sons of the Resurrection," [51] he etched in that position with a stroke or two. The corporate function of judgment was an exigency of the revelation. It was necessary to know who believed in Him and who did not. The excisive principle of the revelation had to be obeyed ; it made folk to be Christ's or Yahweh's or Jupiter's or Zeus's. And the grace unto life of the God revealed in Him had its own final power to distinguish this man or woman as one who was alive or moribund. The *ekklesia* could only judge men and women as they took their place with them.[52] With what tireless and delicately evangelical passion that judgment was to be applied was taught again and again by Jesus. It bloomed in Paul as near to perfection as human beings can attain. Do you notice the most bright mind of the Revealer at work within the small and shadowed folk dialect ? It is never one with it. We moderns seem to have lost sight of that illuminating fact. Then the assurance of this saying of Jesus, to the ancient world and to us, is that the imprisoning powers of the place of the dead could not prevail against the increase of His *ekklesia* of the living. As a Hebrew ox-cart could carry peasants to a king's palace, so their poor idiom of religion is glorified to become a vehicle that carries men and women into union with the

[51] Luke xx. 36. Christ's use of Exod. iii. 2 ff. in verse 37 ff. is an example of His transforming touch on the Old Testament.

[52] Cp. Bede, *In Math. Evang.* xvi. 8 ; *P.L.* xcii. 79a.

energies of the God revealed in Jesus Christ. How an early poet had pictorially seized on the timeless demonstration of this truth can be seen in the oldest Christian hymn-book [53]: "And I went over all my bondsmen to loose them (*i.e.*, in Hades), that I might not have any man bound or being bound, . . . and they were gathered to me and were saved, because they were to me as my own members and I was their Head." We can, if we will, recover the first connotations of this saying, and by their recovery enable ourselves to find at last the true means of conceiving ethically man and the universe. For the present we are taken up with the restoration of primary values to the term kingdom. On its concrete side we discover that Jesus meant by it His *ekklesia* of alive men and women. Their incorporation is due to belief in His revelation. Can this Matthæan saying yield us knowledge that in it Jesus also made quite clear what connections the *ekklesia* had with the unique notes of the revelation?

Our discoveries for this document have been enabled by the restoration to the Greek text of a dropped vowel; and other finds come from the recovery of a dropped portion of a word three letters long. The text of our document tells us that when Peter had made his affirmation of Revealer and revelation Jesus said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; . . . and I also say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My *ekklesia*." The ruling inter-

[53] *Odes of Solomon* xxii. 11 and 14, following the Manchester manuscript. Cp. *Acta Thomae* ii. 155, 217, 286 (ed. Wright).

pretation of this sentence leads to the conclusion that in its first member Jesus used good Semitic, and in its second a Greek pun. Thence has sprung all the trouble about the meaning of the word " rock " or " stone." But the Aramaic that has come out in the Greek text, Bar-Jona, puts aside the specious play on the Greek words *petros*, or stone, and *petra*, or rock. There is a parallelism of names here: Bar-Jona demands *Bar-Kepha*. Jesus called Peter *Son of the Stone*. Then the following declaration gains its outshining sense: " And upon this *stone* I will build My *ekklesia*." Peter himself is a credible witness to this find. In his Epistle [54] he tells us how disciples of Jesus are living stones in God's spiritual house because all are founded on Christ, the *Stone*. Again, when Peter addressed the Jewish priesthood and their kindred in Jerusalem [55] he overthrew them with his speech about " Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, . . . the *Stone* which was set at nought of you builders." Further, this name for Jesus Christ has very long and firm attestation in the extant texts of the anti-Judaic *Testimonia*.[56] This affirms its source in the mode of Christ's revelation with the Old Testament.

Therefore we can complete the concrete phase of meaning in Jesus Christ's use of the word Kingdom: it is the assemblage of the alive through faith in the living God of His revelation. The abstract and con-

[54] 1 Pet. ii. 6 ff.
[55] Acts iv. 5 ff.
[56] Harris and Burch, ii. 60 ff.

crete strata of meaning in the word unite closer than the sides of a coin. It requires no argument to establish that these meanings for Kingdom not only blot out the historical necessity to render it and Jesus Christ in terms of eschatology or prophetic psychology: they confer the better benefit of placing it in its true values and proportion in the revelation of Jesus Christ. It was framed by Him in His own style, and from His own sources. And this Kingdom is an eternal one, with its open entrance to all who are simple and big enough to learn of Him. Further, Christ's view of His Kingdom finally disestablishes the ideas that He was a Messiah and it was Messianic.

D. *The Quality of the Whole of Jesus's Teaching*

The centre of this problem is moved when we realise that in His teaching we have to deal with a revelation which is not a continuance of the thoughts of earlier Hebrew prophets. It moves so that all attempts to appraise the teaching in rabbinical terms are brought into question. Jesus Christ is not a prophet with sweeter reasonableness than Isaiah, nor is He a rabbi with profounder impracticability than Akiba.[57] Moses is made to serve His revelation; therefore the rabbis speak a language other than His. To interpret Him by means of parallels from the Old Testament is to disregard a vital principle and mode of His teaching; and to cluster rabbinical parallels around it is to amass evidence to the effect of how

[57] Cp. Klausner, 392 ff.

different He was from the Talmudists. These differences are not in accent, but in content; they are not in elaboration, but in abrogation. Then the shift of this problem's centre is from a method which depraves to one which evokes the values of the revelation, from a quest for parallels which can never throw light on His mind, and which deny the larger facts of His history, to a search for the structural motives of the exposition of His teaching which chime with the facts of His public life. Why, for instance, is there a Sermon on the Mount? And what reasons are there for its trend?

We must pass from the theory of the Sermon which bases it on a *Logia* document that was Matthew's peculiar source. It has never accounted for anything in the Sermon, and is at best a clumsy explanation of its presence in the Gospel. Another more influential reason than these is the doubt that such a document as the Matthew *Logia* ever existed. It has been proved that the *Logia* connected with the name of the Evangelist were *Testimonia* [58]—that is, a chain of excerpts from the Old Testament used in the manner of the revelation of Christ. There is substantial evidence for this order of *logia;* the other is of the pale substance of all hypotheses, and apparently is of the paler sort which are not wanted. For when we study the Sermon free of such a cumbersome literary instrument we find that it offers naturally a number of important

[58] On the meaning of the *logia* as, for instance, Papias used it, see Harris and Burch, i. 118 ff., ii. 1 ff. A study by Donovan entitled *The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature*, 1924, 32 ff., maintains the old view concerning Papias' use of the term. He appears to be unaware of the bulk of contemporary study on the subject.

points to us. These can lead us to the solution of the problem as to why the Sermon is where and what it is.

The Matthæan scene of the Sermon, the Mount, is as familiar to us as the title of which it is a part. It is known to us in a questionless way so that we have come to think of it as a scenic direction. There is a vital structural quality in this Mount, if we put it with the other factors which the Sermon exhibits. These are, for instance: (1) the Beatitudes for those who are disciples of the Revealer (v. 1–12), or the beatitude of discipleship in its influence on the world (13–16); (2) the rubric and statement of the New Law (19–48); (3) the distinctive deportment of His disciples (vi. 1–23); (4) the providence of the Father towards disciples (24–34, vii. 7–12); (5) Judgment according to the new Law (vii. 1–6); (6) the two ways (13–14); (7) the prophet and the disciple (15–23); (8) the foundations of sand and rock (24–27).

This summary must now be shown to have certain unifying principles, and that in them are the answers to our questions. It requires no subtlety of touch to educe the evidence that where disciples are, there is a teaching which has made them such. That Jesus addresses the sayings, gathered under the title of the Sermon on the Mount, to His disciples makes that profound difference between moral maxims—which are said to have something in common with the philosophy of Confucius—and His revelation. The Lukan account has kept its sense of the other audience—the surrounding folk with their religious leaders. It

enforces this difference between them and the disciples with its own naturalness ; since the contrast of Woes and Beatitudes is the contrast of what Jesus is teaching with that which has been taught. Matthew has excluded the other audience. Or rather, with him the contrasts are implicit. Then he has done a little editing, as we should say. He has excised the other audience from sight. There is much in the document which Luke has not ; though the third Evangelist adumbrates their presence by the inherent framework of the discourse he records. Luke keeps the historic site of the Sermon, as well as the sense of the larger audience. That is not to say : Luke is historical when he puts the delivery of the Sermon on the plain, and Matthew is unhistorical when he says that it was delivered on the Mount. The third Evangelist is geographically accurate : the first Evangelist literally true. When Matthew excised the audience other than the disciples, he gave the discourse a site which most brilliantly set the powers of the teaching to surpass the ancient world. For the Revealer and His revelation are put on the Mount of the Lord,[59] in utter contrast with Moses on the Mount of the Law. And to bring out all that this means for their abrogative dominancy over the ancient world, we have to realise that the mount which was not His, could also bear the name of Gerizim, or Olympus, or of one of the Jovian hills in

[59] Cp. Heb. xii. 18 ff., where the writer seizes the idea of *Mons Domini*. For this *Mount* in *Testimonia* texts, see Cyprianic *Test.* ii. 18, the tract *de Montibus Sina et Sion*, *P.L.* iv. 909 ff. ; Gislebert, *Disputatio Judæi cum Christiano*, *P.L.* clix. 1013 C f.

and about old Rome. We must be quite clear that this transference was made by Jesus. He did not model Himself on ancient mountain-cults that he might attain a theophany. Matthew put Him there, because He had revealed the God who had levelled and can level all such mountains.

The items of our analysis of this document can now fit themselves together, for not only has its principle been found, but also its mental context. These natively interpret the document. For Beatitudes spoken on that Mount mean and give the blessedness of the God of Jesus Christ, to those who had sundered themselves from or were violently treated by the ancient world. Thence they had come through discipleship to Him. Just as we have to come from the immemorial reign of the thoughts and ways of pre-historic man ; and sometimes have to undergo the resentments of those who will not break away from his rule. This poverty in spirit, mourning, meekness, hunger, mercy, purity in heart, and making of peace have alone any meaning where they find their blessedness, and that is in discipleship to the God who reveals Himself in Jesus Christ.

So also do these compose the periphery of operation for the New Law. Its enactments concern those disciples and their attitude to fellow disciples ; their bearing towards others who are not disciples—and all within the environing, paternal compulsions of the God who is alive to make them men. The uniqueness of this ethic is in its depreciable qualities ! Have we

not come to think that? We may take an instance which can appeal to all minds in these post-War days. When about to die, Jesus looked round on Roman, Jew and barbarian, saying: "My Kingdom is not of this world (Roman, Jew and barbarian) else would My servants fight." He was not declaring a better philosophy of civilisation than militarism. He was fulfilling His own New Law. The Revealer was embodying His revelation. His disciples were to do what the erstwhile follower of Siva does when, for Christ's sake, home and relations are denied with ignominy. He just takes up his cross, and the God of the revelation goes on with the work of sculpturing him into manhood. Therein is the uniqueness of this New Law.

Within the same vital periphery only can we reach the significance of Christ's idea of the Father, of His providential care of disciples, of their prayer and judgment; without it we cannot discern the ethic of the Kingdom which works so that human beings are liberated from the empire of themselves and of primitive motives in thought and rite—of the man that has been—unto the manhood which Jesus Christ taught; not as by maxims which have richer ideas than those of Hebrew or Hellenistic prophets, but as by the commerce of an alive human being with the living God through discipleship unto the Lord Jesus Christ. This genetic belief concerns the God whom death could not hold, because He is Life yesterday, to-day, and for ever; and not the creation of post-Resurrection mysticism. Paul did not create this God and His

Christ. Paul was re-created by them. It is our creation of that Revealer and revelation, which makes room for our phantasm of a mystical genius named Paul who fills in the impression of a Galilean prodigy named Jesus. In like manner there are students who, being caught in the contemporary study of the morphology of religion, must cause Jesus and His teaching to undergo a *kenosis* into a Hellenism or a Hebraism or an Oriental Syncretism. The value of that study cannot be exaggerated; nor can its disintegrative faculties, when its findings are divorced from the exacting demands of the historic sense. The very simple truth about these assessments of the teaching of Jesus is that they ignore the primary factor for its interpretation, namely, that it is a revelation. This must be said again and again, even if reiteration becomes wearying. Thus the true mental context of the sayings of Jesus, as they are found in this document of the Sermon on the Mount, will thrust itself on the attention of students of the New Testament; and that context will not be found in Moses or a theologised Paul, but in the nature and mode of His teaching. These, then, as we have been discovering, make Matthew to place the Sermon where he has put it; and they form the radical interpretative instrument of the sayings in the Matthæan document. That is to say, the nature and mode of His teaching are the mental context of the terms which go to make up those sayings. The names which alphabetically explain Him have had their connotations made new by being brought into subjection to the revelation;

even so has the language which composes His sayings received this renewal. Therefore, the connecting of His words with a literary context of near or distant parallels cannot interpret Him. He can be made into a Rabbi, and His teaching made to look like a section from the Talmud—but in the process we have lost both Him and it.[60] For His words have been excised from the context of the revelation—those conditions of the genesis and growth of ideas without which no teacher could be understood. Such a method with Him can only ask, why Matthew gives the site of His Sermon as the Mount, to cause trouble as to authenticity between the Evangelists? It has no time nor care to comprehend that both Matthew and Luke have historical warrant. Jesus is the same Revealer whether on the Mount or on the plain. The essential condition of interpretation is that we must know this if He is to be understood.

When we come back to the text of the Sermon and to its end, we can measure further how urgent a thing it is that we should be able to interpret Jesus in His own terms. The implicit sense of the other audience comes out there. Jesus forbids His disciples to give what is holy " unto the dogs " and to cast " your pearls before swine." And His final words set forth the well-known contrast of building on the sand and on the rock. The " holy " and the " pearls " stand for the disciples' declaration of the revelation. A very able

[60] Cp., *e.g.*, Fiebig, *Jesu Bergspredigt, Rabbinische Texte zum verstandnis der Bergspredigt*, 1924; Strack and Billerbeck, i. 189 ff.; Klausner, 363 ff.

Jewish writer [61] has described the saying which has those designations as "those cruelest of words." Paul followed his Lord's injunction, and like Him he had to bear the cross. This messenger of the revelation warned the Philippians [62] to be "beware of dogs"—that is, the Jews and the Judaisers. Both Lord and servant then used this term. They did that because of the content and claims of the revelation. It would cleave as the sword to the very roots of the ancient world's thought and institutions; it would consume as fire the "wood, hay and stubble" of those older structures—Jesus thus warns His disciples, in language that foresees what will happen when they carry that sword or fire to any of their nation or believers in ancient cults. To describe His language as most cruel is a conventionality as remote from understanding Him and the potencies of His teaching, as is the view of a Jesus who was so mild that He could not be conceived of as uttering the words. Where the sense and values of the revelation are lost such views can be held of Him. The sword and the fire have gone from His words: we neither see how He must be unique because God is revealed in Him, nor how His sword and fire cut and burn unto life and liberty in which men can become men. Thus, such a saying as that we have discussed, is voiceless for those who reduce its scale of values to that of egoistic criticism of those who differ; or perhaps to that of the rude prophetic edge to the utterances of a

[61] Klausner, 395.

[62] iii. 2. The rise of the term is due to the *Testimonia* use of Ps. xxii. Cp. verse 20.

Galilean. Its and their scale of values can be restored if we have recourse to a first century writer who made a noble endeavour to comprehend Jesus Christ. He said " Our God is a consuming fire." [63] Or the same can be done by pondering a saying of Jesus recorded by two Greek Fathers of the Church : " The Saviour Himself says, He that is near Me is near the fire." [64] To assure us that we are not to think of martyrdom, or the cross in discipleship, we have the later version of this saying in the second century Armenian treatise from which we have already gleaned. This version reads : [65] " Truly this is what our life-giving Saviour has said, He who is near Me is near the fire ; and he who is far from Me is far from life." These gleaming symbols of the revelation, fire and sword, stand not so much for the words spoken as the God manifested ; not the poetry of a prophet as he estimates his own and other's revelations, but the action of the God of Truth and Life on cults and men which embody what is not true or alive. And whether to Jew or Greek or Roman or modern European and American, the action of this sword and fire is never for hurt or contempt, but is for ever unto the freeing of the personality that it may " live and move and have its being " in the only God who is Life and Truth for men. Jesus always speaks on this level ; and when we drop below it, in our inter-

[63] Heb. xii. 29.

[64] Origen, *Comm. in Jerem.* xx. 2, and Didymus of Alexandria after him.

[65] Schäfers, 79. The context of this saying shows that the writer interprets it in relation with discipleship. Cp. the use he makes of the *Hebrews* saying : " We will now go and do what the Saviour tells us according to the will of His Father : for God is a consuming fire."

pretations of Him, we make Him to be without meaning.

To bring out all that was meant by the contrast of building on sand or rock, we must study those other instances of Christ's teaching concerning the old Law and the new Revelation. There are two parallel incidents in the Gospels which cover the actual interpretation of the greater part of the Sermon on the Mount. They have not been used for this purpose, the reason being that we have been engrossed with the old Law to the exclusion of the new Revelation. That is, after all, a natural condition of mind when we review the almost era-long attitude towards the Sermon on the Mount. Now these two incidents recount the coming of the Lawyer [66] and the Rich Young Man [67] to Christ. Both incidents have as their pivot questions concerning the fundamentals of the Law of Judah. There can be no one who does not know that; and none who has not recognised the facile enthronement of the commands to love God and man's neighbour as the Golden Rule of Christianity, or of the Decalogue as the Law of God. On the first of these too easy conventions, it may come with surprise to acquiescents to read the following conclusion of a Jewish scholar on the incident of the Lawyer's question in the Markan version. He writes [68] "How far, even to the last, Jesus remained a true Pharisaic Jew is to be seen from another episode. When one of the scribes put the

[66] Matt. xxii. 54 ff.; Mark xii. 28 ff.; Luke x. 25 ff.
[67] Matt. xix. 16 ff.; Mark x. 17 ff.; Luke xviii. 18 ff.
[68] Klausner, 319.

question, " Which is the first of all the commandments ? " Jesus answered, " Hear, O Israel, the Lord one God, the Lord, is one, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, etc." The conclusion that Jesus was a Pharisee is at least connived at by those who isolate the so-called Golden Rule into gnomic empire over the rest of the teaching of Jesus. It is by isolation away from what He is and teaches that He can be said to be merely a Pharisee and a repetant of some verses from Deuteronomy and Leviticus.

Mark associates the recital of those verses with Jesus's reply : " Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." Luke ends them with the parable of the Good Samaritan. Jesus could not be a Pharisee, and hold a concept of the Kingdom which made higher demands on moral achievement than the Golden Rule ; nor could He be a devotee of Deuteronomic and Levitical Law when His parable condemns the embodiers of these two forms of Jewish legislation. Mark's account has no point, if he did not mean to convey to others that the entrance into the Kingdom, taught by Jesus, demanded the love of a God and of a neighbour as these were viewed in His revelation. Whilst the parable in Luke is but a piece of ordinary moral reflection on compassion, though attractively put, if the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho was not a disciple of Jesus Christ. The parable must belong to that class spoken by Him which had to do with the harming and killing of His messengers sent unto men. If viewed thus we can see in it the flashing work of His sword :

Priest and Levite fall before it ; but the pagan Samaritan is within its circling play and life, as if he had heard the wielder of the sword say : " I was the stranger, and ye took me in." Then, the incident of the Lawyer's question has sense if Jesus's idea of God and neighbour find their values in His teaching of a Kingdom, wherein men have life through the God revealed in Himself.

The second incident of the Rich Young Man brings us face to face with what is perhaps the strangest ethical enthronement in Christian thought. The Decalogue holds its unquestioned place with a power which seems to come from questionless ascendency. It is beyond our scope to trace why and how its coronation has come about. We have to ask what part was given to it by Jesus Christ. The Jewish scholar,[69] we have quoted concerning the first, writes on this second incident : " The outlook of Jesus conformed with that of the most observant of His fellow-Jews and was based on the Law." It is hard to see what difference there is between this conclusion and that implied by the rule of the Ten Commandments in Christian ethics and institutions. Even the moral which is drawn from the incident, about the evil of riches, is not more than was heard in any synagogue. That moral was not His. He makes His own point ; and therewith transcends Moses or Epictetus. We do not let Him surpass them.

In the reply of Jesus, to the man who recites the Decalogue as his rule of life, certain matters are put

[69] Klausner, 365.

together which may not be separated. The phrases " Go, sell all thou hast " and " Come, take up the cross and follow Me," compose command and explanation. Of course, He did not teach that a rich man could not be His disciple.[70] Nor did He waste the time of His short public life by repeating commonplace morality on the evils of the world. For the Rich Young Man to become the disciple of Christ meant that the sword of His revelation would cut the entail of Jewish patrimony—those ramifying attachments to the whole of the social tissue of Judaism. Could he venture to follow the One who had not where to lay His head ? That is what bearing the cross would mean to such a man. It would mean the same to Samaritan or Greek or Roman. Zaccheus, then, was a man of finer moral courage and insight than this one who, at the first glance, made a favourable impression on Jesus. His demand is immortal. Not as a maxim in the morals of poverty ; but as the excisive principle unto life for the whole man. The revelation is of that unique sort that only the going-out to it of the whole personality can make men, whether in the first or twentieth century, human beings. There is, therefore, in this incident no verbal antithesis between worldly and unworldly riches [71] ; as if the Lord Jesus Christ was the proto-

[70] Rogge, *Der irdische Besitz im neuen Testaments*, 1897, 56 ff., is at pains to show that Jesus was thinking of overcoming what he calls the " evil of riches," by an inward denial of its temptations. This commonplace in morals has no place in His teaching. The emphasis falls on the idea : " Will a man be my disciple."

[71] Many ascetic writers do and must note that antithesis. We may note that Wendt, *Das Eigenthum nach Christlicher Beurtheilung*, 1898, 100 ff., falls into the same error.

typical mendicant of religion. He does not speak as one who can be imitated ; but as He who reveals the principle unto life, and as well all the ways of vital filiation for men with the God who lives to give them manhood. The power of the Decalogue is in sociological maxims : the potency of the revelation of Christ is in its faculties to create human beings. The incident of the Rich Young Man leads to the same revolutionary conclusion as the Sermon on the Mount.

Its most clear and obvious meaning for us, as it is that which all the conclusions of this book present, is that even Jesus Christ cannot do with us men what He might, if He continues to be remote from us through our untruthful ways with Him as Revealer and the content of His revelation. Also that the God He reveals has too much to work against in man's wayward faculties of apprehension—as the ages of his religious achievement show—that He should be able to fashion us into men, if He is inhibited from His recreative liberation of our personalities by our manifold depravations of the message of His manifestation. Even the new text of Josephus can convict us of having done what we ought not with Jesus and His teaching.

CHAPTER V

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS AND NEW EVIDENCE FROM JOSEPHUS

It is now twenty years ago since a scholar in Esthonia[1] told the world about a version of Josephus's *Jewish War*, which had more in it than the Greek book we have known for some centuries. This version was in Russian of a Northern type and to be dated somewhen in the late Middle Age. These were striking facts. But even more striking than they were the pieces themselves which had no parallels in the Greek. For three had to do with John the Baptist ; two with Jesus Christ ; one with an inscription concerning Him ; another with the rending of the veil of the Temple ; and a last with a reference to the belief in the Messiahship of Herod. Such a catalogue ought to have roused most lively interest. A retrospect of learned work on it reveals a lack of attention commensurate with the subject ; and especially on the part of Christian scholars.

For Berendts had offered stimulating reasons, other than those we have stated, why a great interest should have leapt to meet his work. Since he claimed, for

[1] Berendts, *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im Slavischen " De Bello Judaico " des Josephus*, 1906. For another German edition of the passages, see Klostermann, *Apocrypha*, iii. 11, 1911 ; and for a rendering into English of all the passages, Mead, *The Gnostic John the Baptizer*, 1924, 103 ff., also for three of them, Jackson and Lake, i. 433 ff.

instance, that these passages were not interpolations but belonged to the original text; that the original text was Aramaic or Hebrew; that the North Russian version of the *Jewish War* was based on Josephus's first draft of his book, and for which he is his own witness [2] that it was written in Aramaic or Hebrew.[3] These tempting matters, though set out with skill and learning, called out a sparse response, and then mostly a hostile one.

The broad reason for such a reception is to be found in the fact that the actual beginnings of the learned defence of the passage about Jesus in *Antiquities* xviii., can hardly be put earlier than the years 1913[4] and 1920.[5] On those dates a group of three English and German scholars laid the foundations for the establishment of that passage as coming from the pen of Josephus.[6] Up to then, except in the realm of Apologetics, where it has been most easy to believe almost anything, scepticism had prevailed against the idea that the Jewish historian could have made any direct reference to Christ. The realm where facile assent was unknown had become accustomed to a quick mode of dissent by means of the theory of interpolation. Thus the prevailing opinion on the *Antiquities* passage was that it had been inter-

[2] *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. "Therefore I decided to translate in Greek for those in the Roman empire the account of the war, which I had written before in my native tongue."

[3] *Bell. Jud.* i. 16. Josephus tells it was done for the Jews.

[4] Burkitt, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1913, 135 ff.; Harnack, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, 1913, 1037 ff.

[5] Barnes, *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ*, 1920.

[6] The older criticism of the *Antiquities* passage from Arnold, *Epistolæ de Flavii Josephi testimonio quod Jesu Christo tribuit*, 1661, where it is not hostile, is of an apologetic type.

polated by a Christian. When a Russian version of the *Jewish War* declared that in it was much more about Jesus Christ than in the *Antiquities*, we may understand how its claims, coming into such an atmosphere of cirticism, would have a numbing reception. If the judgment "interpolation" held against one short paragraph in the Greek of the *Antiquities*, then there is the semblance of more than strong logic in that judgment passing over to several longer paragraphs in a late and foreign version of the *Jewish War*. At least the *Jewish War* could not complain of being treated in the same manner as its fellow in literature. It also, being Jewish, is relieved of making complaint that Christian scholars were not eager to come to its help by elaborate examination of its larger text. What held us back? A strange language? Or the rumour that its text was so very different from the existing Greek of the *Jewish War?* Could we not believe that any good thing came from North Russia? Or was it that we feared a Jewish hand might cause Jesus to rise anew from the dead somewhere near to the Arctic circle? The unusual in Nature can disturb us: the unusual in literature ought not to deter us.

Whatever were the reasons, it seems an extraordinary fact that between 1906 and 1924 three Christian scholars [7] only attempted support of Berendts's views by a repetition and not a re-examination of them. These

[7] Lejay, *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, 1906, ii. 447 ff.; Goethals, *Mélanges d'Histoire de Christianisme: Joséphe temoin de Jésus*, 1910; Seeberg, *Von Christus und dem Christentum*, 1908, 39 ff. On Goethals see Soltau: *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1910, 662 ff., and Ussani, *Revista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 1910, 4.1.

attempts brought no new light to bear on either Josephus or the greater matter of Christian Origins. For, of course, it is through the latter that the Jewish historian can find that corroboration which proves his statements to be history or not. Within that period there were some notable attacks on the authenticity of the passages.[8] And among them were several which were not moved by the accepted opinion, that what in Josephus had reference to Jesus Christ could only be interpolated matter—though they conclude for interpolation; but rather by the opinion that where this version of the *Jewish War* spoke about Him, there it betrayed little or no knowledge of Christian Origins. The proof of this claim would establish the inauthenticity of the passages. And new discoveries in the realm of Christian Origins would have the power to disestablish the last reason for thinking them to be unhistoric. But before these things can be entered upon we must make reference to the most recent stage of opinion on the whole problem of the North Russian version of the *Jewish War*.

At the end of 1924 and the beginning of 1925 a Jewish scholar[9] came forward to extend Berendts's

[8] Frey, *Der slavische Josephusbericht über die urchristliche Geschichte*, 1908, is the most notable; see also the articles by Norden, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 1913, 647 f.; Corssen, *Die Zeugnisse das Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus* (*Wellhausen-Heft: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1914), 114 ff.

[9] Eisler, *Quest*, October, 1925, 1 ff. Summaries of and some measure of support for Eisler's views: Lehmann-Haupt, *Frankfürter Zeitung*, December 13th, 1925; Kampers, *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 1925, 558 ff.; Nielsen *Politikens Kronik*, December 21st, 1925; Reinach, *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, 1925, 434 ff.; *Revue Archéologique*, 1926, i. 322 ff., where he summarises Lehmann-Haupt on Eisler's views. Wohleb, *Kirche und Welt*, February 5th and March 3rd, gives a discriminating summary of this scholar's views.

views. After adopting the whole of that scholar's opinions, he proposed to enlarge them on the three following lines : (1) by telling how Josephus got into a North Russian version ; (2) by conjecturing how later Christian scribes had interpolated the authentic base of the passages ; (3) by proving how Jesus was a political revolutionary as, it is alleged, Josephus had made Him to be. This phase of work on the subject is a large advance on the views of 1926. For if the route the text took to reach a North Russian rendering could be made out, a discovery would be achieved of high interest for the history of Christianity. And if, too, it could be proved that Jesus died as the result of leading a rebellious movement, another discovery would be made which must have far-reaching effects on the interpretation of the New Testament and on Christian thought—in a word, on the whole problem of Christian Origins. As to the conjectural restitution of a passage, or passages, in the *Jewish War*, that work is purely subjective, and can only attain the dignity of discovery when such new and other evidential support is found—that Josephus and it become signally and mutually authenticative.

It will be the right thing to do if we take these three lines of the proposed enlargement of Berendts's views and test them for their worth, and then move on to a fresh stage of the Josephus problem. On the first of them, it is said that if Josephus was writing to the Jews of Babylonia, Arabia and Adiabene (as he tells us he was), then his book would have come into Russia

through the Turkish Chazars, who—trading with Persia and Russia, Bulgaria and Byzantium—were converted to the Græco-Russian faith about the beginning of the tenth century. It is an hypothesis, and remains one.[10] We have no records that any such literary process ever went on. Evidence will be shown later why we have no need of a route which is not marked on the literary map of the world.

The other line which might lead to discovery concerns the view of Jesus as a leader of rebellion. Here it is claimed that Mark has several references to the event. For example,[11] where Bar-Abbas is spoken of as " being bound with his fellow-rebels, who had committed murder in the rebellion." Of what nature was this rebellion ? We are told that Mark had made reference to it some chapters before his account of Jesus in the place of judgment. Thus, the entrance into Jerusalem [12] and the overthrowing of the money-changers and the dove-sellers were the notes of this rebellion. Moreover, the parallel account in the Fourth Gospel [13] of the Bar-Abbas incident is said to offer other linguistic support for the above conclusion. There Bar-Abbas is described as being a λῃστής. The translation of that word we have been used to from childhood is

[10] Cp. Marmorstein, *Quest*, 1926, 145 ff. This scholar has pointed out that some of Eisler's reconstructions of the text of Josephus depend on wholly anachronous literary material. An example is where Eisler sees a dependence upon Josephus in *Acta Pilati* (ed. Tischendorf, 1876, 314): " O sweet Jesus, most prodigious among men, if I may call thee a man, who has worked wonders such as never man wrought before." It is surely clear that the *Acta* depends here wholly on religious commonplaces concerning Jesus.

[11] Mark xv. 7.

[12] Mark xi. 8 ff.

[13] Jno. xviii. 40.

" robber." It is now said that the word has the " political meaning of revolutionary bandit," both in Josephus and in the general language of the time. If that be true, then it would be historical to say with this theorist that Jesus was crucified between two " co-revolutionaries." We will look over these points, from the last to the first. There is no evidence from papyri,[14] where we get the general language in which the New Testament is written, that λῃστής had any other meaning than criminal or robber. Neither in early nor late classical Greek is the meaning " revolutionary bandit " to be found. Literally, there is no basis in the text of the Gospels for the term " co-revolutionaries," as applied to those who were crucified on the right and the left hand of Jesus Christ. Luke [15] alone characterises them ; and he as " evil-workers " or " -doers." Further, there is not the slightest thread of union between the entrance into Jerusalem and the scene in the Temple ; nor is there any filiation with either incident and the fact of Jesus being crucified between two of the associates of Bar-Abbas. Rebellion could only be against Rome. There is no historical hint in the Pilate scenes that the Empire had aught against Jesus. Indeed, the theory we are testing can only make connection between the companions of Bar-Abbas and Jesus by italicising an article which Mark uses. Mark says that these men " had done murder in *the* rebel-

[14] Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the New Testament*, *s.v.* ; note also derivatives such as λῃστοπταστής (a detective), or λῃσταρχος (" arch-pirate "), a late second century metaphor.

[15] xxiii. 33.

lion." Luke, on the other hand, uses the words "a certain uprising." Then, it is affirmed, the Markan phrase can only mean the rising which brought Jesus to His death; while the Lukan phrase represents a Pauline softening down of the facts of history to suit his doctrine of Christ as the "Heavenly Man." Both definite article and indefinite phrase are given a weight they cannot bear. And Paul is being used in a wholly unhistorical way. Were other evidence, external to the New Testament, forthcoming for this view of Jesus as a leader of rebellion, then the text of the Gospels would have to be brought into line. But, as we shall see, not even Josephus can support this entirely subjective treatment of the records and figure of Jesus Christ. Its subjectivity rules the theorist's choice of what must be left in or out of the text of Josephus's *Jewish War*. Such work may be learned and ingenious; but it is structurally governed by a foundation which is almost as fluent as nerve energy. Berendts's hypothesis remains; but its extensions in this last theory have to pass.

Let us then recapitulate those views of twenty years ago: (1) That in the passages unknown to the Greek text of the *Jewish War* we have authentic Josephus material; (2) that the North Russian Version of this work represents its Aramaic or Hebrew original. It is plain that they must remain "a daring theory," [16] unless evidence can be disclosed for the truth of the two foci of the Esthonian scholar's hypothesis.

[16] Thackeray, *Selections from Josephus*, 1919, 191.

It will be recalled that the North Russian version of the *Jewish War* has in it three new passages about John the Baptist. We may begin with them, though they are of secondary importance for Christian Origins, because they have had some advertisement in English for a few years.[17] They are, however, of first importance for the discovery of some of the evidence we need. Their essential matter reads :—

> " There wandered then among the Jews a man strangely clad, for where his own hair did not cover his body he was wrapped in *ox-hides*,[18] and his appearance was just like a wild man's.[19] . . . His lips knew no bread ; not once at the Passover did he eat unleavened bread, saying, That in remembrance of God, Who had liberated the people from slavery, was the bread of consolation given to be eaten, for the way was a sore one. Wine he did not take nor know. And he turned from animal food ; and was stern ; and *wood shavings* [20] was his food." [21]

The two italicised words are of great interest. By a

[17] Jackson and Lake, i. 433 ff. A just complaint can be made against these writers for their treatment of the Baptist passages. They have translated them as if they were one piece of narrative. And then headed by comments which would be unlikely to attract students to their serious study.

[18] Making allowance for the local touch in this rendering, it seems that the original of the Old Slavonic version had the same reading as *Codex Bezae* (Mark i. 6) ενδεδυμένος δερμην καμηλον, with no reference to a girdle. The Latin side of the *Codex* is not helpful. Since it renders the phrase " Vestitus pilos camelli." Nor is its second phrase about the food of the Baptist more helpful : " et aedebat locustas et mel silvestrae." See the text of this chapter.

[19] This piece follows *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7.2.

[20] " Holzpäne " in Berendts and Klostermann. Mead translates " tree produce " ; Frey, 31, is equally puzzled—for the meaning of the German word is " chips " or " shavings."

[21] This piece follows *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9.1.

superficial valuation they could be claimed to mark the apocryphal nature of the narrative. Another judgment comes into view, when we understand that they are in the North Russian translation through a misunderstanding of the Old Slavonic text. The second of the two words merits close attention. As it stands it represents an impossible food, even for an ascetic of the desert. If from Josephus we turn, for a moment, to the New Testament,[22] we find ourselves among more familiar facts concerning the Baptist. For instance, he is there said to eat " wild honey." At least that is how the English version renders the Greek words *μέλι ἄγριον*. Now those words do not mean that the bees fed the Baptist. They mean sweet (or succulent) pulp or sap.[23] There is little doubt that the Evangelists refer to John's use of the pulp or sap of the Carob-bean,[24] the Palestinian desert-dwellers' source of moist food. The Josephus text had said this quite plainly. That is a notable feature. It does not speak of " locusts and wild honey," with the received text of Matthew and Mark. The squalid [25] and intermittent diet of locusts was not in the text which the Old Slavonic translated. John fed on the " horned bean," as the Greeks call it. That was the food also of the Prodigal Son in Jesus's parable.[26] And the bean bears the name in folk-lore of

[22] Matt. iii. 4 ; Mark i. 6.

[23] Cp. Gould, *International Critical Commentary—Mark*, 1896, 8, who follows Meyer, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar, ad loc.*

[24] Cheyne, *Ency. Biblica* ii. 2135 f. On the Carob, see, for instance, Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants* IV. ii. 2 ff.

[25] I borrow the epithet from Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, 1921, i. 472, where can be found the views of the Arab on such foods.

[26] Luke xv. 16 : *τῶν κερατίων*.

" St. John's bread." [27] Such a usage had passed into the Old Slavonic translation ; but when it had come into North Russia, the carpenter's shop and the woodman's craft were better known than the desert ; and John was made to eat from the shavings or chips,[28] of one or the other, rather than from the immemorial source of a food that is almost drink. This one point is sufficient to establish that, in the passage above cited, we are dealing with a very early document, and one written by a person who directly knew the story of John the Baptist, and not mediately through the New Testament. The other features of his statement go to prove that. He sees John as a Jew would, who understands him to be the Voice calling to men to prepare the way of Jesus Christ. Neither North Russian nor Southern Slav could have imagined the Baptist as this Jew had depicted him. For the North Russian had even to put some local colour into his coat of skins and his food. Further, the three passages contain manifest evidence of how the Southern Slav treated the material of the Baptist's life.

A reference to the citation about John will show that something has been omitted between its two portions. The two do not make up the three pieces concerning him which are in this late mediæval version of the

[27] Another name for it is " locust-bean." If now we follow the guidance of the original to the Old Slavonic text of the *Jewish War*, we may conclude that the received text of Matthew and Mark contains a sort of gloss. And instead of representing two sorts of food, we have there the " locust " name for the bean followed by an attempt to explain its qualities as a food.

[28] This local need to change the Baptist's food has a long history. For example, the Ebionites made the " locusts " into " cakes," and the Encratites into " milk."

Jewish War. It is surely quite clear to any sensitive eye that the two portions, which compose our citation, are complemental one to the other. The first introduces a long statement concerning the Baptist's subversive work among the Jews and his hailing before Archelaus. And the second closes an account of a dream seen by Philip the tetrarch and of John's accusation of Herod, which is couched in language of a very different type from itself. Moreover, a third piece [29] introduces a Simon, an Essene ; and he talks in the same sort of language as is used in the Archelaus and Philip pieces. Their harmony in ideas and language, later than those found in the original small portions, is the consequence of their coming from an Old Slavonic *Vita* or *Acta* of John the Baptist.[30] We have here the only instance of interpolation in these passages from the *Jewish War*. It is done without subtlety. Two slight threads of connection, which appear in a phrase each, are deliberately made with the original Josephus material—they are through the Baptist's food, and this time he eats " reeds and roots and wood-shavings," and the descriptive phrase " a wild man." Thus, these later pieces stand out as if linen had been patched with coloured silk. Once we understand that the North

[29] This follows *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9.1, but precedes the passage concerning Philip and Herod.

[30] I have decided to leave out all references to Slav literature because of the nature of the book I am writing, and also for the reason that when the full translation of the Old Slavonic text is published therein, and in their right place, will appear those references. Further, that for it will be reserved all information concerning manuscripts of Josephus in Old Slavonic. This work is to be done with the help of an expert in the ancient Church language. One other reason why these things should come where they ought is that there is ample evidence for the authenticity of the new passages without them. This my book presents.

Russian is rendering an Old Slavonic version of Josephus, we can dismiss the mercurial ways of subjective criticism with the passages.

And we might have been led to this discovery a long while ago, if we had heeded the fact that Berendts had recorded (but did not use) an Old Serbian version of Josephus's *Jewish War*. There are others in Europe. And in due time the translation of the Old Slavonic text will be published. Meanwhile, it is enough to state that the North Russian version has an extra defractive screen in it, so far as language is concerned, than the Old Slavonic. The latter is made on the Aramaic or Hebrew ; the former is made on the Old Slavonic, and this amply accounts for many of its variants from the Greek text.[31] The reason, then, for the finding of a singular text of Josephus's *Jewish War* in North Russia is that it came there through the highway, for ancient Christian and relative literature, of the Church language of the Slav lands. We must go on to demonstrate, from other passages of greater importance for Christian Origins than the references to the Baptist, that the Jew who wrote about him was Josephus.

Now it is what the *Jewish War* has to say about Jesus and His religion up to the year 70, which means supremely for Christian Origins, and as well for the authentication of the passages in a book by Josephus.

[31] The footnotes to the German translation of the North Russian *Jewish War* (done by Berendts and Grass, and now being published by the latter scholar), so far as I have seen them, go very far to remove the opinion that its text is so far away from the Greek as to suggest that it could not have come from the Jewish historian.

We will then translate and analyse the first [32] of the two passages concerning Jesus. It runs :—

> " At this time arises a man, if one may call him a man, who by his nature and behaviour showed himself as if more than human. His works were wonderful ; and he worked wonders, strange and powerful. Thus it is [33] possible for me to call him a man ; though looking at him in every way, I would also not call him an angel.[34] And all he did, he did by word and command ; as if by some inner power.[35] Some said of him that our first law-giver had risen from the dead and showed forth much healing power. Others considered that he was sent of God. But he opposed altogether the Law ; and did not hold the Sabbath according to ancestral custom. Yet he did nothing overtly criminal ; but by word he influenced all.[36] And many out of the people followed him and received his teaching. And many souls wavered wonderingly whether by it the Jewish tribes could free themselves from Roman hands. Now it was a habit of his to stay much on the Mount of Olives in face of the city. And also there he manifested his

[32] This follows *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9.3.

[33] The North Russian has a negative here. It is evident that this has been borrowed from the succeeding sentence, where it is in place. Cp. *Antiquities* xviii. : " since it is proper to call him a man."

[34] Josephus would not do this because " Angel " was another primary name for Jesus, and from the ancient anti-Judaic mode unto nomenclature for Him. *E.g.*, Acts v. 19. Cp. Cyprianic *Test.* ii. 5 (Angelus et Deus) ; Tertullian, *P.L.* ii. 622b ; Ambrose, *P.L.* xvii. 564b ; Justin, *Trypho* xxxiv. 2 ff. ; 1 *Apol.* xxxiii. 5 ff. ; Eusebius, *Eclogae Propheticae* i. 10 ; Jerome, *P.G.* xl. 860a.

[35] A touch from the Semitic psychology of a prophet.

[36] An observant description of the abrogative powers of His revelation.

healing powers to the people. And there gathered to him ' Slaves ' [37] a hundred and fifty, and many from among the Folk. When they saw his power that all was as he willed by means of the word, they besought him that ' he should enter the city and cut down the Roman soldiers and Pilate, and rule over us.' But that he scorned.[38]

" And thereafter, when the Jewish leaders got to know of it, they assembled themselves with the high priests and said : ' We are powerless and weak to stand against the Romans. But as also the bow is bent, we will go and tell Pilate what we have heard, and we will be untroubled ; lest if he hear it from others, we be robbed of our goods and ourselves cut down and our children scattered.' And they went and told Pilate. And he sent and had many of the people struck down.

" And as for the wonder-worker, he had him brought before him. And when he had tried him, he perceived [39] that he was a doer of good and not of wrong ; neither a rebel, nor a striver after political power, and he set him free. He had given heed to his perturbed wife.[40]

[37] We have seen already that an ancient name " Slave " was for Jesus Himself. Cp. Acts iv. 25 ff. ; *Didacte* ix. 2 ; Burch, 195 f.

[38] Eisler, *Quest*, 4, deletes this little sentence. But that is to uphold his idea of Jesus as a revolutionary. That view is not an historical one.

[39] From this point down to the words " their purpose. And " Eisler, 5, has another deletion for the same reason as the above sentence.

[40] The North Russian version has misled others, so that they have thought Jesus to be subject of this sentence. Eisler thus translates : " For he had healed his dying wife." And concludes that this is an allusion to the apocryphal legend about Pilate's wife. That, as we see, is an unwanted conclusion. He also obscures the passage unnecessarily by finding that this

> " And he went again to his accustomed place and did his customary works. And as once again more people gathered to him, so that his works were more celebrated than ever; the Scribes became filled with envy and gave thirty talents to Pilate [41] that he should kill him. And after he had taken, he consented that they should themselves carry out their purpose. And they took him and crucified him according to imperial [42] law."

This remarkable piece of evidence is replete with ancient notes. Its opening is in the style of the *Antiquities* passage concerning Jesus : " And there ariseth at this time Jesus a wise man ; since it is fitting to call him a man, for he was a doer of no common works," etc. Here, too, we may notice that the language of the account of the Baptist is identical with the two just brought into comparison. For the moment, this agreement will not be urged as a Josephan feature. It is well, however, to bear in mind that the *Antiquities* passage is presumptively from the pen of Josephus. Another most early note is in the name given to the disciples of Jesus, " Slaves." This is not a Pauline creation ; though Paul explicitly and often uses the name for himself. We have seen that he got the name from his Lord. And it is so deep in the primary

is a representative interpolation on the part of " Paulinist Cæsarized Christianity to exonerate the Roman officials." This motive, if ever it was an historic one, is absent from the whole document or documents.

[41] Cp. *Epistle of Tiberius to Pilate* (James, *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, 1899), 78 ; also Thackeray, 191.

[42] The North Russian has the word " ancestral." Its German translation should be emended to " kaiserliche."

thought of Jesus, both for Himself and His disciples, that the accepted text of the Gospels has almost lost sight of it. Further, the passage has a just sense of the contemporaneous feeling after rebellion—and especially among those whom he describes as hovering between Judaism and discipleship to one who, because the people listened to Him, seemed the right leader against Roman subjugation—and Jesus's own sense of rendering unto Cæsar the things that belonged to him. The passage is in harmony with the New Testament; though, as is quite clear, it tells the historic facts from the standpoint of a Jewish observer.[43] The biggest literal surprise in it, however, is in the shifting of the burden of Judas unto the shoulders of Pilate. Pilate receives the thirty pieces of silver.

No early Christian could have written that. The historic certainty for the followers of Jesus was that the Jews brought about His death. It would be a greater impossibility for this to have been written by a Christian hand after the first two centuries; since, down to the extreme limit of the Middle Age, that historic certainty had increasingly taken fashions of opposition to the Jews, which bore sometimes the dreadful fruit of reprisal. The Middle Age would not do from impassioned opinion what the first two centuries could

[43] This view saves both Josephus and the New Testament. Frey, for instance, is too exigent throughout his book on the reliance or irreliance of the historian on the New Testament. The main work of confirmation from the latter is surely to be found where it and the *Jewish War* come together on the principles of things, and as seen through Jewish eyes. Josephus would not rewrite the trial narrative, nor the Resurrection stories, nor episodes from the Acts; he would have seized their formative motives and put them in his Jewish manner.

not have done from historic and religious belief. Let us recall that Josephus was writing his first version of the *Jewish War* for Jewish readers. He would then put the blame on the Romans. In the earliest stratum in the Talmud, for instance, that is the endeavour of the Jews. When Josephus turned his Aramaic or Hebrew original into Greek for Roman eyes there was every reason in the world why the original should be expurgated. It is a vain thing to suppose that references to Jesus would have to be cut out, because He had been a leader of revolt against Roman rule. History knows that He was not such a rebel. Josephus, as an historian, also knew that. But if as a Jew, when writing to Jews, he had made Pilate into Judas—and these new texts of the *Jewish War* record that he did—then we have found the right reason why Josephus excised certain portions of his book when he was writing to the Romans. Without this shift of *rôle* for Pilate, there is no reason at all why any change should have been made in his original text. Josephus knew what the writer of that empty piece of irony, *Le Procurateur de Judée*, ought to have known—that the Romans would remember Jesus. Hence, not only had the Pilate calumny to go, but also any other reference to events contemporary with Jesus. It is plain that such expurgation would not have been necessary if there was not at the heart of the essential material a statement which no Roman eye must see.[44] We have

[44] The older criticism of the text of Tacitus has made out a case for Josephus's *Bell. Jud.*, as one of his sources ; Lehmann, *Claudius und Nero und ihre Zeit*, 1858, i. 33 ff. ; Beckurts, *Zur Quellenkritik des Tacitus*, 1880,

lacked hitherto an adequate resaon for Josephus's silence concerning Jesus. We find that he knew very much about Him ; but he feared lest Roman readers would learn how he had stated what he knew.

A return to our text will show us that, though the writer made Pilate into Judas, he also put some of his own countrymen to shame. The Scribes are represented as bringing about the end of Jesus through hatred. They bribe Pilate. And it is they who take Jesus and crucify Him. Only a Pharisee could have put things in that manner. And we cannot fail to notice how the historical fact of crucifixion thus bitten in is tempered, for his Jewish readers, by the final turn of his sentence : Jesus dies under Roman law.

There can be no doubt, for any one who will study language apart from critical or theological predispositions, that the passage we have examined is a whole. It is not a medley of Jewish original and Christian interpolation. That it is not a Slav creation is obvious. The Slav enlargement of the Baptist passages sufficiently demonstrates that position. It is Jewish.[45] Then the questions immediately appear : Is there definite early evidence that this passage was in Josephus's *Jewish War ?* And is there such evidence for Aramaic or Hebrew version of that book which

59 ff. But Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite*, 1893, 255, considers that Tacitus in no fashion used Josephus ; cp. Corssen and Norden. Bacha, *Le Génie de Tacite*, 1906, 243 ff., sees the influence of the Jew, but is vague as to where in his writings. There seems no reason to doubt that Tacitus did not use the *Jewish War* as a source ; and especially did he not know of its original version. What a mordant page he could have written on Judas in the guise of Pilate !

[45] See Lejay and Thackeray.

contained references to Jesus ? Actual confirmation in answer to those two questions would complete the case for the passage's authenticity. This also is to be found.

That this passage concerning Jesus was in Josephus's *Jewish War* we may learn on the authority of an early Christian writer. He had compiled a history about the Jewish War with the Romans, and chiefly from Josephus's two works—the *Antiquities* and the *Jewish War*. What pieces he chose he translated into Latin ; thus he made a kind of full *résumé* of Josephus. This he did not in the manner of a flowing narrative, with a general and prefatory glance at his sources. He introduces the name of his principal source on many occasions, when he writes his own connecting comments. There is then no place for the theory that we may have in him, and as a consequence in the Old Slavonic Josephus, a passage concerning Jesus, either from his own pen or some other's later than the Jewish historian. Another excellent feature in this writer is that he natively knew Aramaic or Hebrew. For though his name when fully Latinised resembles that of the second century Christian historian, Hegesippus, it is Josippus or Joseppus when partly Latinised.[46] This writer was evidently a Christian Jew.[47] He must on no account be confused with the Hebrew writing which goes under the name of the *Great Yosippon*,[48]

[46] Cp. Ussani, *Memorie del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze*, 1922, Lib. i. line 5.

[47] His names and his use of sources show that. *E.g.*, Mead, *Quest*, 1926, 400 ff., fails to recognise the distinction.

[48] Neubaeue, *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1899, 355 ff., who writes on this work as it is contained in *Cod. Bodl. Heb.* d, 11.

or of a little earlier writer with the name Yossipon who is mentioned in *The Chronicles of Yerachmeel.*[49] That he knew Josephus in the original languages is very plain. His citations from the *Antiquities* are from the Greek. And what is much more to the purpose of our investigation is, he knew the same version of the *Jewish War* that has passed into the Slav lands.

For Hegesippus records[50]: "Concerning this matter the Jews themselves testify, by Josephus the writer of histories, saying: In that time ariseth a wise man, if one may call him a man who was the creator of wondrous works, who appeared to his disciples living again after the third day of his death, according to the writings of the prophets, who had prophesied these and innumerable other marvels concerning him. From whom began the *ekklesia* (congregatio)[51] of the Christians and penetrated all sorts of men; nor is any people of the Roman world left which has no share in his cult."

This conflation of Josephus is even more valuable than the simple quotation of a single passage from him. For Hegesippus has combined his knowledge, both of *Antiquities* xviii. and the *Jewish War* passages in his first sentence. The arising of a man, who is said to come from the dead as prophesied by the prophets is the *Antiquities* passage over again. The

[49] Gaster, *The Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, 1899, xv., etc.
[50] Weber, *Hegesippus*, 1858, 152.
[51] This word appears to have exactly the connotation of *ekklesia* in Matt. xvi. 18. Some render it by the word "synagogue." But that appears to be the result of their belief that Hegesippus is a Jew interpolated by a Christian or Christians.

phrase " a man who was a creator of wondrous works " is literally from the original of the first passage in our new version of the *Jewish War*. And Hegesippus's second sentence is most evidently based on the other new passage from the same original which yet we have to translate and examine. We may be sure that this writer, or epitomiser of Josephus, is citing his first century authority, for we are informed again (in the close neighbourhood of the above passage): " hoc dixit Josephus." The theory that this is interpolative work cannot stand for a moment. A writer does not state that he will epitomise an earlier writer that he may interpolate him. Indeed, the character of the whole of Hegesippus's work is against such insensitive theory. When also there is found a version of Josephus which has in it matter that he puts into his epitome, the theory of interpolation is shown to be a blind conclusion. And we must not neglect to remark that Hegesippus's use of *Antiquities* xviii., in an interwoven manner with the Semitic text of the *Jewish War*, is a substantial affirmation of that passage's authenticity. To it we must return before this chapter closes. We are at present still concerned with the details of the two answers demanded by this part of our investigation.

If then we have exhibited to us candid evidence of the use of Josephus's writings, in Greek and Aramaic or Hebrew, by a man who knew those languages, we shall do well to inquire as to his date. The usual view is to say concerning him that he could not be earlier

than the fourth century. This opinion appears to rest on the feeling that Ruffinus [52] may have been the translator of the *Historia*, on the presumption that a translator was required who would have been able to translate a Semitic writing into Latin. Such a view is a needless one, because it is evident that Hegesippus was a Semite who knew Latin. Or that century is set as a terminus, because from the earliest edition [53] of Hegesippus the book has been attributed to Ambrose of Milan. It is true that some manuscripts do ascribe the writing to the Milanese theologian: "Incipit Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi De Historia Joseppi." [54] But this ascription seems not to mean more than the fact that the writing was used in the time of Ambrose. It is a temporal indication which may not be despised. Especially in light of other evidence from the manuscripts of Hegesippus.

Another indication is even more precious. The oldest manuscript of the *Historia* has this heading: "Incipit Sancti Cipriani Præfatio Super Quinque Libros Historiæ Joseppi De Bello Judaico." [55] The varied lists of Cyprian's writings do not appear to provide for this item as one of his literary works. It is certain that this *Preface* could not have been written by either Cyprian of Antioch or Cyprian of Gaul, to whom has been awarded that queer pseudonymous

[52] Cp. Weber, 393, Havercamp, *Flavii Josephi Opera Omnia*, 1726, ii. 196.

[53] Ed. 1510; *Aegesippi Historiographi Fidelissimi Ac Dissertissimi Inter Christianos Antiquissimi Historia De Bello Judaico . . . A Divo Ambrosio Mediolanensis.*

[54] *E.g.*, *Cod. Bernensis*, 180, perhaps of the tenth century.

[55] *Cod. Vatican Palatinus*, 170, of the tenth century.

work, *Cæna Cypriani*. But it could have been written by one of Cyprian's school. That there was a very deep interest in literature concerning the Jews, in Africa of Cyprian's time, is witnessed to by the bishop's own edition of the most ancient Christian work concerning them, the *Testimonia Adversus Judæos* [56]; and also by the group of writings put under his name in the earliest manuscript gatherings of his writings. The suggestion then is a natural one that in Hegesippus we have one of these Christian writings concerned with the Jews—works which indicted the Jews, either from the principles of the revelation of Jesus Christ or from their own history—which arose in the Church of Africa, at or about Cyprian's time. The temporal limit of the fourth century would thus have to be forced back. Hegesippus would belong to the third century; and by so much we should be nearer the century when the events—Josephus had recorded and Hegesippus epitomised from him—had taken place.

Our second question seeks to know if there is direct evidence for the existence of the Aramaic or Hebrew version of the *Jewish War*. It was known in England of the eleventh century. That curious and wideawake scholar, Giraldus Cambrensis,[57] met the famous Prior of St. Frideswide's Priory, near Oxford, and gained the knowledge from him. Robert of Cricklade,[58] as he was named, was a collector of Josephus in Hebrew.

[56] That this writing is of vaster importance for early Christianity, and not only because of its text of the teaching-mode of Jesus Christ; see Burch, 151 ff.

[57] *De Principis*, 65; *Opera*, ed. Warner, 1891, viii.

[58] *Dictionary of National Biography*, xlviii. 368 ff.

He informed Giraldus that out of the several copies which had come to him two only kept testimony of Christ as part of the text, and these looked as if recent attempt had been made towards erasure.[59] In all the other copies the text was as if this testimony had never been there. We are told plainly that the Prior, who, during his career, was also Chancellor of Oxford University, was an Hebraist.[60] Indeed, because he was that we learn that the Jews were reluctant to send him copies of the Hebrew Josephus.[61]

Such a straightforward piece of evidence for Josephus in Hebrew can mean only one book of his ; and that, on the evidence of the historian himself, was his original of the *Jewish War*. It has been turned into something less simple than itself by the endeavour to find in Robert's evidence a reference to a Hebrew *Yosippon* [62] ; and the fact that no known manuscript of that work, which is virtually Josephus's *Antiquities* in Hebrew, has the celebrated passage of the eighteenth chapter in the Greek. We know now that this is a wrong line of search. The two Slav versions of Josephus's *Jewish War*, and the historian's own statement concerning his first Hebrew version of that book for the Jews, go to

[59] " In quorum duobus testimonium hac de Christo consequenter et integre scriptum invenit, innuo vero quasi nuper abrasum."

[60] " Et Hebraicæ quoque linguæ non ignarus."

[61] " Quoniam magis eum familiarem propter linguam Hebraicam quam noverat habebant."

[62] That most excellent book, Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, 1893, 285 ff., is inclined to do that. Its author notes the later Hebrew condensation made of Josephus under the name of *Yosippon*. And tells us that no known manuscript has the *Antiquities* passage. Whilst that is true, he has not realised that this work is not the one which Robert handled. Nor is he free to recognise that the equation which matters for the text of the Hebrew *Jewish War* is Josippus = Hegesippus, the Hebræo-Christian writer, and not *Yosippon* = a Jewish condensation of Josephus.

prove that what Robert of Cricklade saw was that version with the testimony to Christ (in two copies) almost erased. For we must claim that where new evidence is found for Jesus Christ, there must be wrought such revision in our critical views as will give the varied lines of evidence for Him the benefits of illumination. That simplicity has to be urged, for there is reluctance on the part of scholars to give Him the same chances of appearing as He is as they would have to grant to one of the Cæsars or Mahomet. The history of Jewish literature in the Middle Age, and its treatment of Jesus Christ, does not aid the belief that then the text of Josephus would not be tampered with.[63] The way of the Talmudists had not died out. We cannot view these matters from the standpoint of Jewish scholars of to-day who handle manuscripts with impeccable probity. We have all learnt better than what was done, in the Middle Age and earlier times, with manuscripts. Christian and Jew alike have erased and added unto. We live in other days, and the imperious call of discovery is one thing we have learnt to obey. Therefore, it is submitted, that as regards the two important questions we have had thrust upon us by the appearance of evidence, we must affirm that Josephus's *Jewish War* in its original Hebrew version had been known and cited, and seen with the passages concerning Jesus Christ almost erased.

[63] Marmorstein has urged that the Jews of the Middle Age would not have erased passages from Josephus in Moslem or Pagan environments. He, too, is thinking of *Yosippon.*

Hegesippus knew more than one passage in the *Jewish War* about Jesus Christ. His epitome has told us that. We must now inquire into the passage which the Hebræe-Latin had woven together with the first one in the Hebrew *Jewish War* and that from the Greek *Antiquities*. It is as follows :

> " Again Claudius sent his procurators to those states, Cuspius Fadus [64] and Tiberius Alexander, both of whom maintained the people in peace, in that they did not allow them to turn away at all from the pure laws.[65] But if anyone departed from the word of the Law,[66] and was summoned before the teachers of the Law, often they expulsed him and sent him before the Emperor's presence.
>
> " And at the time of these two many had been found to be ' slaves ' of the previously described wonder-worker ; and as they spoke to the people about their ' Rabbi,' [67] that he is living, just also as he had died, and that he would free them from slavehood, so many of the folk listened to the above-named and took up their Law.[68] Not

[64] *C.I.L.* vi. 16691.

[65] Cp. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11.6.

[66] That " pure laws " equal " the Law " is apparent. The other place in the *Bell. Jud.*, where these procurators are mentioned, shows that they did not change the " ancestral customs."

[67] It should be remarked here that Josephus is not giving Jesus the rabbinical title ; he is drawing upon his knowledge of the primary Christian nomenclature for Jesus.

[68] This is the " New Law " of Christ. Not that Judæo-Christian account of it the " Law of the Gospel " which has been satirised in the *Talmud*. But the " New Law " celebrated in the Sermon on the Mount. That Barnabas knew, *Ep.* ii. 6, with its appropriate *Testimonia* basis. The concept which Paul declares, and sometimes had difficulties with because of his Jewish upbringing and nature. Cp., *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho* xxiv. 1 καὶ ἄλλος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ Σιὼν μόμος, etc.

because they were notable people ; since they were all humble folk, some only traders, others sandal-makers, others manual workers. But they showed forth wonderful signs, in truth what they would.[69]

" But when those noble rulers saw the disaffection of the people, they consulted with the scribes to seize and kill them, since ' the little will be not little, if it ends in being great.' But they withdrew [70] and feared because of the signs, and said to them : ' In the ordinary way such wonders do not happen. If they do not come by God's ordinance, they will be quickly doomed.' And they gave them authority to treat them as they willed. Afterwards being beset by them, they sent some away to the Emperor, others to Antioch, others to distant lands according to sentence.

" But Claudius removed both procurators and sent Cumanus." [71]

We shall see that this passage could not have been written later than the year 70. But before so doing, readers cannot fail to comprehend that this was Hegesippus's other source for the second sentence of

[69] Eisler thinks this sentence refers to the Apostles, and, therefore, is an interpolation. Surely it has to do with the Christian community, whose prophetical work, as we know from the Acts, was accompanied with " signs." There is, too, some Josephan irony in the statement.

[70] Eisler excises this and the next sentence. He misunderstands the first of them, because he considers that it was the procurators who feared and withdrew because of the " signs." It is clear that the subject of the sentence are the scribes. That is the Josephan sting in the statement. He has turned actual history against them. For we know from Acts v. 34 ff. that it was a Pharisee who warned his fellow-Jews against wrong treatment of the Christians.

[71] Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 54.

his epitome. Josephus records how the Christian "congregation" was made to penetrate into every part of the Roman world: Hegesippus having read him, states the matter as an accomplished fact. When he interwove a sentence from the Hebrew *Jewish War* into the text of the *Antiquities* passage, it is not a strain on credulity to trace the material to the other passages concerning Jesus in that version where it occurs. On the basis of reason alone that, is a more satisfactory explanation than the theories of interpolation which almost require a magic carpet for the use of interpolators that they may ride over the sundered centuries and into such disparate parts of the earth. What Hegesippus puts into a summary the Slav versions have in full. And the older of them is from Josephus's Hebrew original. Let us now turn to what is the more important phase of this passage's authentication. Is its light on Christian origins true?

If the discoveries which have been told in this book could not have been made, the light of this passage would be startling. But the facts of the first years of the religion of Jesus are put down simply by a Jew. It is valuable history that Josephus knew the facts of Christ's trial and crucifixion, and that he had created his own Judas; it is almost more valuable that he pencils in the notes about Jesus as living again.[72] More valuable than even these known matters is his

[72] According to my findings Josephus does not give a description of Christ's personal appearance. Some newspapers have told us that Eisler has found such a description in the North Russian version of the *Jewish War* (*e.g.*, *Daily News* 2. vii. 26); cp. Wohleb, *Frankfürter Zeitung*, 29. vii. 26. This scholar may have been misreported.

digest of primary Christianity. Thus, in the time of Cuspius Fadus were those who were the " slaves " of the worker of wonders, Jesus. These lived according to the " New Law." For, you will notice, that the Jewish narrator puts into contrast " pure laws " or " the Law " and the " New Law." Further, that these taught that their " Rabbi " was alive from the dead. And how simple folk listened to them that they might be freed from social slavehood. The naïve society of traders and sandal-makers and hand-workers still bore the oldest name for Christ's disciples ; still called him " Revealer " ; and still taught His revelation according to His teaching mode, which had abrogated Judaism in behalf of the God revealed in Him.

Let us be careful to notice that a Jew is writing these things from his own point of view. The intrigue of the procurators with the teachers of the Law, his own belief in the Law, his patronisingly historic way with the lowly followers of Christ, are among the unobtrusive Jewish features of his narrative. The Pharisee again shows himself where he puts the burden of killing and banishing the Christians on the Scribes. When such a writer sketches in the religion of Jesus Christ in the terms of His revelation—and that is done so as to show some of its chief *Testimonia* motives—then we can be most sure, with the literary evidence of the centuries in our hands, that we are dealing with narrative that belongs to the first century, and whose writer is acquainted with the first movements of our

religion. Josephus and the previous discoveries in this book mutually confirm one another.

This dual authentication of fresh knowledge for the first century has its startling side. For that knowledge is out of harmony with our ruling theories on Christian Origins. A theory is thought to be elastic, and a dogma to be inelastic. But a proper review of the critical world of to-day shows that certain of its theories hold our minds as if they were made of a network of most pliable steel. Those formalities of view, for instance, which confuse the Old and the New Testaments [73]; the God of Israel with the God revealed in Jesus Christ; the superhuman powers of creation and pervasion of thought granted to Paulinism; the concept that the law of Christianity is but the Mosaic Law spiritualised to some not very high degree; the historical opinion held that anything like a New Law did not appear before the time of Irenæus—these are among the reigning formalisms which forbid us to think in first century terms. A major contributory cause to their rule is the unhistoric opinion that the Christhood of Jesus, and consequently the mobile scheme of ideas which became known in the world outside Palestine as Christianity, were creations of the enlarging society of believers.[74] This opinion sterilises the idea of Jesus as Revealer, and precludes the associated idea of a revelation in Him. A contributory cause of about equal power is the view that there are some types of

[73] *E.g.*, Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1894, i. 80 ff.
[74] *E.g.*, Jackson and Lake, i. 265 ff.; Dobschütz, *Die Urchristlichen Gemeinde*, 1902, *The Apostolic Age*, 1909.

anti-Judaic feeling shown in the New Testament by a few of its writers ; for instance, Luke and John and Paul in chapters ix.–xi. of the Epistle to the Romans.[75] But there is in this view more emotional idiosyncrasy than religious monition. This is especially to be seen in the example of Paul, in whose writings, it is argued, that those three chapters represent the single instance of his anti-Judaism, and that therefore this was a passing phase of his teaching which had no effect on contemporary thought.

These powerful formalities of critical theory, we must urge once more, are not the inevitable formulæ of such an investigation of our origins as could not be gainsaid. They are attempts to prolong the sway of Erfurt rather than the understanding of Galilee. Others choose a Conciliar site, or a redecorated Geneva, or even Ur with its mountain-cult. We talmudise in our many manners. We seem to find that more convenient than the admission of men and women into the marvellous context of the God who lives to make them men and women, and through the living way He has chosen. Thus we talmudise ; and the world of human beings, as we see them through the short vistas of experience and history possible to us, is stayed in its progress. It would be an unprepared *rôle* for Josephus, if he is to play the part of a guide for us to the wells from which we have not drawn.

[75] Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908. It is a pity that the authority of this scholar, from whom we all learn, should have been thrown on that side of opinion which makes anti-Judaism in Christianity to be a second century product. Of course, it is to be traced to the revelation of Jesus.

The passage in the *Antiquities* we have known so long could perhaps have marked him down as likely to become something he was unaware of, but without the new passages he was not perfected for the part. Some ocular fault, or rather the unrealised strength of the power to talmudise in us, seems alone able to account for the critical history of the *Antiquities* passage. We must turn to it once more.

> "And there ariseth at this time Jesus a wise man; since it is proper to call him a man, for he was a doer of uncommon works, a teacher of men who receive new words with gladness; and many Jews and many, also, of the Greeks, he won to himself. This was Christos; and when Pilate, on the charge of the chief men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those who loved him at the first did not cease their attachment to him, for he appeared to them the third day living again, the divine Prophets [76] having spoken these things and thousands of other wonders about him. And even until now, the 'people' of the Christians named after this man is not extinct."

We are now in a position to take the crux from this passage. It has been shown that the name *Christos*, as borne by Jesus, had no Messianic content. Early Patristic writers have misled us in this matter. Origen[77]

[76] Eisler called this a "valuable allusion" to the *Testimonia* mode. Then he excised the passage as being Christian. Barnes, 11 ff., has already seen the Josephan irony in the allusion.

[77] *Contra Celsum* i. 47; *Comm. in Matt.* x. 17. See Barnes, 15 ff. The point, too, of Origen's rather confused references is that Josephus had no *belief* in the Messiah. We have found that *Christos* had another

has raised unwanted problems by filling the name with Messianic meaning; and so also has Jerome.[78] They were requiring Josephus to say what he did not, and ourselves to believe in the impossible concerning him. Just as a modern scholar, to whom much is due in the recent scientific rehabilitation of this passage as authentically Josephan,[79] when he tells us that though Josephus had abandoned the Messianic hope, that he uses the name *Christos* in a manner that is unparalleled either in Jewish or Christian literature. As if the historian had become a Messianist in paradoxical part by the use of the historic sense! Moreover, the granting to Josephus of a unique usage of the name does not aid our faith in the truth of the passage. He would be reporting something about Jesus which was known, or nothing at all. The two other passages from his *Jewish War* serve to bring out that point. They also show him to be conversant with the nomenclature of earliest Christianity—that vital and simple method for the understanding of Jesus. Josephus knows that He was *Christos* in that style. Here, as in his other references, he gives us most valuable aid for the realisation of the first values of the teaching of Jesus. And his sarcastic reference to the *Testimonia* mode of the revelation—how the prophets had foretold His death and resurrection, and thousands

connotation than the Messianic, and that, of course, it is true that Josephus had no belief in Him.

[78] *De Viris Inlustribus*, xiii. Eisler wrongly sees in Jerome's Messianic interpretation of the phrase, "This was Christos," the original. If it had been Josephus would not have written true history.

[79] Burkitt, *op. cit.*

of other wonders, is all the more precious to us for its glint. The Jew in him was bound to satirise this new way of Christianity with the classical literature of his religion. There is identity of spirit in the *Antiquities* passage and those of the *Jewish War*. The historian was recording what he knew; and not in a manner to put a strain on his or our credulity, but to do honour to his historic sense and his loyalty to the things he believed.

A third feature in this passage brings its quota of confirmation for the claim that Josephus had knowledge of the mode of Christ's revelation. He speaks of the "people" or "nation" of the Christians. We have only to cite, for example, Paul's mosaic of *testimonia* in Rom. ix.–xi. to see the place that the concept of a "new people" has in the teaching of the revelation.[80] The very valuable Cyprianic text of the mode draws particular attention to this concept. It is a radical one to a revelation which abrogated the religions of the ancient world, and would draw men from all nations into interoperative spiritual relations with the God it revealed and with those who followed the Revealer. Josephus records this religious name, and with the same glint in his comment as when he spoke of the teaching-mode whence such a name came. This passage then knows, as do the two others in the

[80] As far back as Vitringa, *Dissertatice Historie—Philogogice : Josephi de Christo*, 1696, 29, the meaning of this word has been diverted from its source. He contrasts Acts x. 28 : ἀλλοφύλῳ. He has the old and persistent view of another people added to the ancient Israel. Whereas Josephus uses the term, with its connotations, as found in Cyprianic *Test.* i. 19–20; Barnabas, *Ep.* vii. 5. That is to say, in exactly the same way as Jesus used it, and Paul after Him.

Jewish War, just those facts about Jesus Christ and His revelation which an observer must have found if he was living before the year 70.[81]

An early writer has told us that the hand of a little child can lead men into truth. It may seem a strange claim to have to make, but new evidence demands it, that Christians should take the hand of Josephus to be led back to things concerning Christ the Revealer and His revelation, which they have forgotten. What matters the hand if we can go back! We shall not return only to fill in a number of historical facts which have dropped from the memory of Christendom. We need an enlivened conscientiousness towards history if we are to recapture the spell and content of the revelation of Jesus Christ. But we must go back so that we comprehend, for all the powers of our personalities, how that the God revealed in Jesus Christ moulds and enlivens the whole of them so that we may become men and women.

[81] Their keenly sensitive awareness of the fact is one of the best reasons for dating those statements so early. It is not my intention to deal with the three remaining passages in the *Jewish War*. The eighth passage is certainly historic. It tells, in one sentence, of the belief which some had that Herod was "Christos"; see Tertullian, *De Præscriptione*, *P.L.* ii. 60. Eisler has also pointed this out. The passage on the Rending of the Temple Veil seems to me to represent the half-bewildered, half-ironical comments which Josephus would be likely to pass on such a proclaimed event; and for that concerning the 'inscription' Eisler's comment may stand: "It contains nothing that Josephus could not have said, and nothing that might not be true." But on one condition; it must, as it stands, be recognised that the North Russian is a faulty text.

THE BEDSIDE BIBLE

By W. L. COURTNEY, LL.D.

Author of "The Literary Man's New Testament," etc.

Cr. 4to. 15s. net.

The Observer says: "Is the Bible read as it was? The answer from the religious standpoint is 'No.' It is less usual than in the last generation to meet people who knew it backwards. Now it is certain that the majority of intelligent persons have never read it through even once. The comment from the literary standpoint is that we are the worse for the change. It is impossible without familiarity with the Authorised Version to enter into the soul of English. But though there is no substitute for the whole, and astounding felicities may be encountered in the driest tracts of genealogy and chronicle, it is an aid and a joy to have near at hand always a full selection of the greater passages chosen for their merit as literature and for no other reason. The marvel is that it should have been left to Mr. W. L. Courtney to do this office for us. Nearly twenty years ago he brought out the 'Literary Man's Bible,' which was admirable as an anthology, and has kept a place in the affections of many readers. But the form was by no means worthy of the matter. Similar in contents, the new 'Bedside Bible,' with its large type and noble margins, is a far more shapely and attractive book. As a collection of scriptural passages, majestic, lovely, kindling or penetrating, Mr. Courtney's choice, as we now have it, is without a rival in the English-speaking world."

WITHOUT FEAR OR FAVOUR

By

The Rev. BASIL C. BOURCHIER

Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.

The Bookman says: "The Vicar of St. Jude's on the Hill here delivers himself of strong opinions. He is dissatisfied with many of the present customs of the Church. He urges that fifteen or sixteen is the very worst time for Confirmation. . . . Again, there should be a revised lectionary. He feels that the Church has been too long playing for safety. In the writer's opinion, the Church has long been paying an intolerable price for its establishment, and signs are not wanting that the Church to-day is in danger of getting the wrong type of ordinand. Mr. Bourchier is also incisive on the question of Sunday games: 'Which in the sight of high heaven is the more acceptable . . . a tennis match or a gossip match?' There are chapters on Poverty, on War, on Death—'Those that are Asleep'—on Missions, on Preaching, and on Justice. Mr. Bourchier writes with particular earnestness on our duty towards animals. 'Oh, for imagination, that we might see the seal clubbed to death!' This is a manly book, and the crowds that throng Mr. Bourchier's church in the Hampstead Garden City will rejoice that their pastor's voice should reach a still wider audience."

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM

By SHEILA KAYE-SMITH.

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

The Saturday Review says: "Whatever attitude one may take up with regard to the Anglo-Catholic movement, it is impossible to ignore it. To assert that it has transformed the entire face of the Church of England is merely to state the obvious. At every stage of its advance it has been bitterly opposed by the bishops, and for many years it was wholeheartedly distrusted by the vast majority of the laity. But it has gathered impetus and inspiration with the passing of time. 'Where have you been, Mr. Dean?' asked a former Bishop of London of Dean Stanley. 'To St. Alban's Church in Holborn,' was the reply. 'And what did you see there?' 'I saw three men in green. And you will find it very hard to put them down.' The task, indeed, was to prove an impossible one. At the present moment the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England is the only section that is displaying any signs of real vitality. The rapid growth of this extraordinary movement is a phenomenon which the historian of the future will have to explain as best he may. Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith's little book pretends to no very deep research, but as a popular history of Anglo-Catholicism it could hardly be bettered."

Burch, V.
Jesus Christ and his
232.902
B892